FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-216
Thursday
9 November 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-216 CONTENTS *9 November 1989*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Joint Chiefs Shift Strategic Arms Stand *[TASS]* 1
Verification Studied at Geneva Arms Talks *[Moscow Radio]* 1
NATO Computer Exercises Examined *[TASS]* 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

East European Reforms Assessed 'Positively' *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI No 45]* 2
Congratulations on October Celebration Received 4
    From Communist Countries *[PRAVDA 8 Nov]* 4
    More Greetings *[TASS]* 5
Obituary of CEMA Institute Director Shiryayev *[IZVESTIYA 6 Nov]* 6

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports Gerasimov Press Briefing 9 Nov 7
    UN Decision on Central America 7
    Role of Warsaw Pact 7
    New York Chemical Weapons Talks 7
    Visit of French Foreign Minister 7
    Discusses Lebanese Crisis 7
    GDR Events 8
UN To Discuss Possible U.S.-USSR Initiative *[TASS]* 8
Justice Minister Speaks at UN Human Rights Forum *[Moscow TV]* 8
UN General Assembly Continues To Debate Apartheid *[TASS]* 9
Asia-Pacific Economic Forum Plan Discussed *[Kovalev in IZVESTIYA 4 Nov]* 9
European Ecology Forum in Sofia Called 'Success' *[Zhmyrev in PRAVDA 8 Nov]* 10
Balkan Ministers Discuss Trade at Bucharest Forum *[PRAVDA 6 Nov]* 11
New Research Center To Study Mediterranean *[IZVESTIYA 7 Nov]* 12

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Previews December Talks with Gorbachev *[Moscow TV]* 13
December Summit Termed 'Intermediate' Meeting *[TASS]* 13
    Zagladin on Gorbachev-Bush Meeting *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 7 Nov]* 13
Orlov Delegation Observes Virginia Election *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* 15

China

Heilongjiang Delegation To Visit RSFSR *[Moscow International]* 15
More on Beijing Reception for October Revolution *[PRAVDA 7 Nov]* 16
Academy Fires Fang Lizhi for Role in June Unrest *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Nov]* 16

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Visit To Ease Tensions in Region *[Tokyo KYODO]* 16
Sakharov Visits Hiroshima, Speaks on Perestroyka *[Tokyo KYODO]* 17
    Leaves Japan for Home *[Tokyo KYODO]* 17
Mission To Study Japanese Government Economic Role *[Tokyo KYODO]* 18
U.S. Resistance Hampers Pacific Naval Disarmament *[Dmitriyev on Moscow International]* .. 18

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Australian-U.S. Ministerial Talks Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 8 Nov]* ... 19

Near East & South Asia

Supreme Soviet Congratulates Lebanon's Mu'awwad *[IZVESTIYA 8 Nov]* ... 20
IZVESTIYA on Political Developments in Lebanon *[6 Nov]* ... 20
Envoy Tarasov Discusses Mideast Peace Search *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* ... 21
Faults of Baker, Shamir Plans for Palestine Seen *[Balebanov on TASS]* ... 22
Saudi-Officered Rebel Units Targeting Kabul *[IZVESTIYA 4 Nov]* ... 22
CPSU Representatives Depart Morocco 28 Oct *[TASS]* ... 23

East Europe

Further Reportage on GDR Leadership Changes ... 23
  SED Politburo Resignations *[Moscow Radio]* ... 23
  GDR Government Resignation *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* ... 24
Krenz Addresses SED Central Committee 8 Nov ... 24
  TASS Reports Krenz Speech ... 24
  ADN Cited on Krenz Address *[TASS]* ... 25
  SED Ready for 'Fundamental Reforms' *[TASS]* ... 25
  Radical Economic Reform 'Indispensible' *[TASS]* ... 26
Krenz Answers Questions at Moscow News Conference *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 44]* ... 26
ADN Reports Schabowski News Conference in Berlin *[TASS]* ... 28
Moscow TV Reports GDR Political Developments ... 28
GDR Eases Travel Restrictions; Rallies Continue *[IZVESTIYA 7 Nov]* ... 29
Article Sees Changes in GDR Irreversible *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 5 Nov]* ... 30
Mitterrand Greets Gorbachev on October Holiday *[Paris Radio]* ... 31

West Europe

PCI's Rubbi Comments on Meeting with Gorbachev *[Milan L'UNITA 5 Nov]* ... 31
FRG's Kohl Issues State of Nation Statement *[TASS]* ... 32
  Comments on East Europe Developments *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* ... 33
FRG Caution About Immigrants From GDR Noted *[7 Nov]* ... 33
FRG Poll Shows Increased Trust in Soviet Union *[PRAVDA 9 Nov]* ... 33
USSR-FRG Banking Commission Meets in Frankfurt *[IZVESTIYA 8 Nov]* ... 34

Latin America & Caribbean

Supreme Soviet Delegation Visits Guatemala ... 34
  Meets President Cerezo *[IZVESTIYA 4 Nov]* ... 34
  Joint Report on Visit *[IZVESTIYA 6 Nov]* ... 35
End of 12-Month Truce in Nicaragua Analyzed *[Zafesov in PRAVDA 8 Nov]* ... 36

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Coal Industry Minister Meets Vorkuta Miners *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* ... 38
Vorkuta Union Signs Contract With Strikers *[IZVESTIYA 6 Nov]* ... 38
Ryabev on Meeting Miners' Demands *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 1 Nov]* ... 39
Riga Gorkom Hits Critics of October Revolution *[IZVESTIYA 4 Nov]* ... 41
Commentary Views October Revolution Slogans *[Rogachev on Moscow International]* ... 42
Disturbances at Baltic October Celebrations *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 42
Lithuania's Prunskiene on Independence Issue *[Vilnius International]* ... 43
Lithuanian Deputies Protest CPSU Baltic Statement *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 11 Oct]* ... 44
Radio Interview With Lithuania's Brazauskas *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 46
Brazauskas' Concluding Speech at Plenum *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 18 Oct]* ... 47
Lithuanian, USSR Writers Unions Sign Accord *[Vilnius International]* ... 49

Lithuanian Citizenship Law Outlined *[TRUD 7 Nov]* 50
All-Union Komsomol on Lithuanian League's Split *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Nov]* .. 50
Vilnius Radio 'Pursuing Own Policy' *[Vilnius International]* 51
Report on Gorbachev's Talks With Estonian Deputies *[Tallinn International]* 52
Residence Qualifications Focus in Estonian Election *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Nov]* 52
Baltic Meeting on Economic Coordination *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 21 Oct]* 53
Roundtable Held on Local Self-Government *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 44]* 53
Bromley Further Defines Federation Concept *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 21 Oct]* 55
USSR Ownership of Republic Land Questioned *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 15 Oct]* 56
Oct Revolution Anniversary Marked in Azerbaijan *[Baku Radio]* 59
Azeri Council of Ministers Deputy Chairman Chosen *[Baku Radio]* 59
Gang Arrested for Murder of Azerbaijani Plant Head *[IZVESTIYA 4 Nov]* 59
Armenian National Movement Congress Concludes *[IZVESTIYA 7 Nov]* 60
Academician Sees Strong Armenian Position *[KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN 27 Oct]* 60
Armenian Movement Paper Begins Publication *[Yerevan International]* 61
Yerevan on Train Unloading Situation *[Yerevan Radio]* 61
'Tense Calm' Prevails in Nagorno-Karabakh *[Moscow Radio]* 62
Correspondent Reports Situation in Stepanakert *[Moscow TV]* 62
Scant Information on NKAO Upsets Soldiers *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Oct]* 63
Blockade of Nagorno-Karabakh Continuing *[Yerevan International]* 65
Kazakh Party Official on Election Campaign *[PRAVDA 1 Nov]* 65
Kiev Radio Program Discusses Nationalities Issue *[Kiev International]* 67
Ukrainian Poll Results on Election Draft Laws *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 43]* 68
1 Oct Lvov Incident To Be Investigated *[Kiev International]* 69
    Increased Tension in Lvov *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 1 Nov]* 69
Demands for Removal of Kharkov Monument Ignored *[IZVESTIYA 6 Nov]* 71
New Body on Consequences of Chernobyl Founded *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* 71
Secretary Girenko Visits Moscow Plant 2 Nov *[IZVESTIYA 4 Nov]* 72
Secretary Manayenkov Visits Steel Plant *[IZVESTIYA 4 Nov]* 73
Pugo Visits Moscow Aircraft Complex *[PRAVDA 4 Nov]* 74
Razumovskiy Talks to Workers at Plastics Plant *[Moscow Radio]* 75
    IZVESTIYA Account of Visit *[4 Nov]* 75
    PRAVDA Account *[4 Nov]* 76
Zaykov Visits Motor Vehicle Plant *[PRAVDA 1 Nov]* 77
Zaykov Visits Milk Processing Plant *[Moscow TV]* 77
    Urges Improvements *[PRAVDA 2 Nov]* 77
More on Komsomol Central Committee Plenum 80
    Abalkin Addresses Commission *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Oct]* 80
    Mironenko Plenum Address *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Oct]* 80
    Further on Mironenko, Komsomol Program *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Oct]* 85
    Plenum Decrees, Resolution *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Oct]* 86
    Procedure for Selecting Officials *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Oct]* 88
    Auditing Commission's Personnel Changes *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 29 Oct]* 89
Lithuania's Macaitis on Komsomol Decision *[Vilnius Radio]* 89
Congress of RSFSR Komsomol Organizations Set *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Nov]* 90
Posters Urge Protest at Lyubyanka Prison *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 90
MVD Responds to Criticism of Remand Conditions *[PRAVDA 31 Oct]* 90
Journalists Briefed on MVD Troop Deployment *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Oct]* 91
Baklanov Talks With MiG Aircraft Plant Workers *[PRAVDA 3 Nov]* 91
Readers' Letters Show 'Spiritual Unease' *[IZVESTIYA 6 Nov]* 92
Draft Law Seeks to Improve Leave Conditions *[PRAVDA 20 Oct]* 94
Deputy's Comments on Kuriles Spark Reaction *[PRAVDA 4 Nov]* 94
Novosibirsk Obkom Elects First Secretary *[Moscow TV]* 95

Economic

Officials Debate Reforms at Economic Conference *[PRAVDA 6 Nov]* 95
Key Ministries Assess Transportation Problems *[GUDOK 22 Oct]* 104
Silayev Attends Quality Control Forum *[PRAVDA 5 Nov]* 105

Military

Yazov Comments on U.S.-USSR Military Contacts
[Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI 6 Nov] 105

U.S. Joint Chiefs Shift Strategic Arms Stand

LD0811172989 Moscow TASS in English 1704 GMT 8 Nov 89

[Text] Washington November 8 TASS—The Joint Chiefs of Staff are now willing to support a U.S.-Soviet treaty reducing strategic nuclear arms without first resolving a long-standing superpower dispute over tests of space weaponry. The newspaper WASHINGTON POST writes this today with a reference to a senior military official whose name has not been given.

"The informal Joint Chiefs of Staff position is a key shift in the military's position on the issue and appears to remove one of several obstacles to U.S. acceptance of a Soviet proposal to defer agreement on space weapons and move ahead with completion of the strategic accord," the newspaper writes.

"The official did not directly explain why the chiefs of staff had shifted on the issue. But asked by a reporter if there is 'any point of the horizon' at which the chiefs of staff would support a U.S. decision to conduct highly realistic space weapons tests, the official said, 'No'.

"Without such tests," the newspaper points out, "the two superpowers presumably would have no grounds on which to disagree over unresolved ambiguities in the treaty compliance."

The Soviet proposal, advanced by Foreign Minister Eduard Shavardnadze at a September meeting with Secretary of State James Baker "has attracted interest at the White House," the newspaper writes. An interagency group of arms experts recently began discussing its implications, several Administration officials said, according to the newspaper.

Verification Studied at Geneva Arms Talks

LD0711202989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 7 Nov 89

[Excerpt] Intensive work within the framework of the 12th round of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons has already been going on in Geneva for over a month. Vladimir Dmitriyev, our correspondent, reports from Switzerland.

[Dmitriyev] The main task is to prepare an agreement on reducing by half the strategic arsenals of the USSR and the United States. The provisions of the future treaty and accompanying documents are being worked on at plenary sessions and in special groups.

As Yuriy Nazarkin, head of the USSR delegation, stated in a conversation with your correspondent, great attention is being paid here to aspects connected with the problem of verification [kontrol]. The Soviet side has backed, and continues to back, the widest and most effective verification [proverka] of implementation of restrictive and prohibitive measures regarding all the strategic offensive arms which will be covered by the treaty. A proposal to this effect has also been submitted by the U.S. representatives. The participants in the negotiations are studying trial verification [kontrol] measures which could be implemented before the conclusion of the agreement.

Describing the atmosphere at the negotiations as businesslike, U.S. delegation head Richard Burt, speaking at the Institute of International Studies here, expressed the hope that the treaty—in a good and proper form, as he put it—will already be signed in the course of a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting which is coming up in 1990. At the same time, Burt noted that the two delegations in Geneva still have a lot of work ahead. [passage omitted]

NATO Computer Exercises Examined

LD0611205189 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 6 Nov 89

[Text] Brussels November 6 TASS—NATO began a major military exercise on Monday. Not a single soldier, sailor, or airman is involved in the exercise.

Sophisticated computer software is used to simulate combat from Norway to the Mediterranean.

The Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe, near the Belgian town of Mons, receives information about losses, captured and lost population localities, etc. Exercise Ace 89 is due to last eleven days.

One of the variants of third world war is actually played on computer. But details of how war breaks out in the game are secret.

NATO commanders and their staff will have to make decisions based on computer data and analyses.

Computers will test actions of commanders and will determine the winner.

A spokesman for the NATO headquarters said that the exercise will test senior commanders and NATO's communication systems. He added that it is much cheaper than getting troops out and also said this saves damaging the environment and upsetting the local population.

Certainly exercises with the use of computers only look harmless compared with exercises involving troops, local observers note. Nevertheless, exercises show that NATO strategists are ever more actively working out dangerous scenarios of new wars.

East European Reforms Assessed 'Positively'

PM0811170589 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No 45, 5 Nov 89 (Signed to Press 31 Oct 89) p 7

[Article by political scientist Yevgeniy Ambartsumov: "Not Agony, but Turn to Life. Reforms in Eastern Europe and Destiny of Socialism"]

[Text] "The agony of socialism"—that is how many Western commentators have assessed the tempestuous, truly pivotal events of recent weeks in the GDR, Poland, and Hungary. But the question arises: Why then is the Soviet Union not intervening in the changes taking place among its neighbors and allies and, moreover, why has it displayed an entirely loyal attitude toward the new forces which have taken the helm in these states? These forces, Eduard Shevardnadze noted recently, "are coming because that is what the people want. And these states are not ceasing to be socialist, allied, or friendly states for us."

Apart from everything else, the point is that it is not socialism which is agonizing, but a specific totalitarian Stalinist type of socialism, and the perestroyka forces in the USSR geared to the opposite democratic model of socialism, are ultimately interested in the definitive collapse of Stalinism with all the understandable costs of that revolution. Yes, a revolution, because it is a case not of improving socialism, but of radically transforming it. To be more precise—of building real socialism in which Marx' fundamental concept of society could be implemented, where the free development of each person is a condition for the free development of all. Whereas to this day, the main value and aim of development has been the state to which society was subordinated, while man was reduced to the function of a tool and object of development.

The revolutionary nature of the present turn also lies in its departure from the essentially Utopian aim of building some kind of ideal society, in its focusing of attention on the improvement of life today and tomorrow, on citizens' daily interests.

This fundamental change of guidelines is truly (here we can agree with Western observers) the most important event since World War II. But it is by no means the end of socialism but, on the contrary, its beginning, or to be more precise its renewal, broken off by Stalin's totalitarian counterrevolution. Because even if noncommunist forces come to lead particular East European states, that does not mean that they are rejecting basic socialist ideas as fundamental values, even if they disown socialism by which, however, they mean the Stalinist administrative model of socialism. We should not close our eyes to the fact that Poland and Hungary and perhaps other countries are suffering from unpleasant relapses into the "primitive accumulation," which was messed up in the forties, and from illusions of "free capitalism." Nonetheless the positive results of precrisis development have settled in the masses' consciousness and people will scarcely want to abandon those memories. In addition the very idea of socialism is irresistible—that is borne out by all world development, not restricted to the socialist countries. That is why we treat calmly, even sympathetically, the changes in neighboring fraternal countries and look into the future with optimism.

The thrust of the changes in the economy lies in the rejection of state monopoly and petty regulations and the transition to the multiplicity of forms of ownership and economic activity. It involves varied forms of the cooperative movement and lease relations, ownership through joint-stock companies, the participation of foreign capital, and private enterprise. According to calculations, in the next few years nonstate forms will encompass from one-fourth to one-third of the economies of the countries which are being reformed although state ownership—and there lies the difference between the East European countries and the West—will still remain basic. The dissemination of a particular form will be determined by its relative effectiveness, which the state has been unable to ensure, although it will retain its positions where this is preferable for society.

The switch from the system of state distribution suitable only for extreme conditions (historical experience has shown that) to normal market relations is a complex and slow business and is accompanied by the costs of adapting to a new, more strenuous, but essential more normal work regime. It is easier where state-monopoly socialism has not completely trampled the shoots of individual initiative and private enterprise. As, for instance, in the GDR, although the leadership there has avoided publicizing the actual multiple-sector nature of its economy and the prevalence of the private and cooperative sector in many types of services. For the Soviet Union, where independent peasants and other strata who were the bearers of nonstate initiative were eliminated by Stalin 60 years ago, this transition is particularly difficult. It is aggravated by the ideological taboo against private ownership although the private auxiliary farms and many cooperatives which have been retained in our country are essentially phenomena of the same order.

In social life a transition is taking place away from often senseless and wasteful labor (alongside our own never-ending construction projects let us recall the hundreds of mothballed enterprises in Poland and the uncompleted hydraulic power station on the border between Czechoslovakia and Hungary) to rational and purposeful labor which is finding confirmation of its social usefulness on the market from customers and consumers and not at state depots. This is also a transition from leveling down to individual initiative and labor creation, from social homogeneity (its apologists were essentially implementing the grim anti-Utopias of Zamyatin and Orwell) to social multiplicity.

It is true that this also presents a real danger of growing unemployment and that this involves the existence, if not the growth, of whole social groups living on the poverty line: But these phenomena at least will not be concealed, as has been the case in our country until recently. That is why the East European countries, while abandoning corrupting social parasitism, will retain an active policy of social protection and will set a limit to indecently large, provocative differences in income and prosperity levels.

Advances in the political life of the East European countries which are being reformed are determined by the transition from one party's monopoly of power to a pluralist system. This change is gratifying since the communist party's political monopoly has frequently resulted in its own degeneration and the flouting of internal democracy and the rights of its members.

If in the USSR, Yugoslavia, and some other places political pluralism is developing within the framework of a one-party system, in Poland and Hungary it is merging into a coalition system of power. Having taken over from the stage of futile strong-arm conflicts, it has resulted in constructive dialogue and cooperation between the coalition parties.

It is gratifying that the new leadership of the GDR has embarked on dialogue with the population of its own country. It is not surprising that the flood of emigration, eroding the country's strength and potential, immediately began to subside.

I also assess all these changes positively because in the East European countries they essentially signify a return to the democratic, peaceful path elaborated by Lenin back in August-September 1917 for the development of the revolution under the leadership of either a coalition of parties of socialist orientation or by one such party and then another alternately. Or a return to the first years after the war, when the experiment of truly democratic and truly coalition governments, which had scarcely begun, was soon fiercely overthrown by Stalin, who had returned to his usual "witch-hunt" both inside and outside the socialist world.

Pluralism is also being asserted in the cultural and ideological sphere, when the desired unanimity is no longer being taken as reality and, conversely, fruitfulness is being revealed in diversity of thought and the multiplicity of ideas, which, in fact, has always existed but used to be suppressed. Tolerance for different views, the transition from an edifying or menacing monologue to dialogue, and the institutionalization of debates and disputes are revealing the productive nature of compromise and restoring the integrity and beauty of national cultures formerly split and emasculated by the absolutized doctrine of class struggle. A basis is being created for elaborating a nationwide consensus and for restoring nationwide and indeed general human values.

Because this process means a departure from the ethical relativism and nihilism which distinguished dogmatically understood Marxism-Leninism, especially in its Stalinist form [sentence without main clause as published]. In this connection it is natural that there should be a growth in the moral and political prestige of the church not only as the refuge of ideas which reject the absolutism of state power, but also as the embodiment of eternal and absolute moral values.

It was no accident that the poet advised making no distinction between defeat and victory. In this temporary retreat Marxism and socialist doctrine in general are drawing new strength and overcoming the Pyrrhic victory of the former absolute (falsely absolute, actually) power.

The natural and just rehabilitation of formerly suppressed national and cultural traditions and of historical memory may, however, also give rise to a wave of nationalist arrogance and rancor. That is a serious danger both for us and for our East European neighbors.... Each of our peoples will have to struggle, as Lenin perspicaciously advised, primarily against its own nationalism, especially great-power nationalism.

I have tried to reveal the general trends which have prevailed in some socialist countries, but in others are so far developing secretly. The process of the revolutionary reformation of socialism is invincible.

It would be irresponsible to fail to see beyond this perspective the crisis which is being experienced by the socialist countries which are reforming themselves, a crisis whose roots, however, lie not in reform and not in socialism but in its distorted understanding and corresponding practice. Help in overcoming this crisis is vitally important for the population of the socialist countries and their reforming forces. That is why the East European countries' search for Western sources of aid and economic boosting are perceived as something natural. A reassuring contrast with Stalin's 1947 taboo on these countries' acceptance of the "Marshall plan!" But today the reforming socialist countries need not so much urgent injections of goods and finance (although they are also needed) as a thoughtful strategy for bringing these countries—through the copying of modern technology and management and through joint ventures and so forth—to the level of modern world development.

But I can already hear indignant objections from some—not all!—Western conservatives and intransigent East European rejecters of socialism: This aid is dangerous because the West will be feeding its own enemy! But forgive me, do you not understand that the new political thinking, geared to the world's unity and mutual aid and not to class antagonism—is in earnest and for ever?! Otherwise surely Foreign Minister Shevardnadze would not have denounced unconditionally for all to hear the erection of the Krasnoyarsk radar station? West and East must understand that an end has been put once and for all to the "Brezhnev doctrine" and adventures like the Afghan one.

Of course, overcoming imperial thinking in the public mentality is not simple, it requires time both in our country and among the Western great powers. But there should be no doubt as to the seriousness of our intention.

In this connection I shall say that our public, in my opinion, can and must express directly and for all to hear its denunciation of actions which contradict the modern, democratic understanding of socialism, in whatever socialist countries these actions may take place (actually, the public has long been trying to act like this). This position may not coincide with the official position, often conditioned by diplomatic considerations but for reforming, democratic socialism this too is a normal matter.

In connection with the dissemination of the new thinking, with the reduction of armed forces in Europe, and with the defensive nature which—again thanks to the process of reforms—the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine has acquired, this military-political alliance itself is also changing. As it loses its ideological conservation aspect, the Warsaw Pact will no longer be able to be viewed as a threat to the outside world or to internal development.

Of course, the Soviet Union's geopolitical interests and influence remain as an objective factor—in a modern, "noncamp" form, of course—and it would be frivolous to ignore them. I think we can count on the gradual dismantling of the military alliance, but that has to be with a similar evolution in NATO. Figuratively speaking, the parallel and symmetrical dissolution of the bloc structures in the single European home in which superfluous walls will disappear.

That is why, without refusing to discuss the question of the possible "neutralization" of a particular East European country, I think there are no grounds for forcing a change in their allied status. After all, with this status, in the new situation they lose nothing and risk nothing, while the rejection of this status could create an imbalance in Europe. It is no accident that even Zbigniew Brzezinski is now persuading the Poles that Poland's membership of the Warsaw Pact is a positive factor. As for intentions (they are voiced by some East European extremists) to split the Soviet Union from Europe and drive it into an autarkic ghetto, they are fraught with unpredictable consequences—they are resolutely rejected by sane Western politicians.

The reform of socialism is an overall process which is returning us to the mainstream of world civilization, which, thanks to this, will acquire a peaceful, truly democratic nature.

Congratulations on October Celebration Received

From Communist Countries

PM0811144789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA-TASS roundup dated 7 November: "The World Celebrates a Great Anniversary. The October Victory Was an Important Landmark in Mankind's Development"]

[Excerpts] Warsaw—Relations with the Soviet Union are of a key nature for Poland. We advocate their constant development and will observe the treaties which bind us, being champions of mutual respect for our partners' national interests and special features and of every people's inalienable right to seek its own path of development. This is stated in Polish Foreign Minister K. Skubiszewski's address disseminated at a ceremonial soiree held in the Polish capital to mark the great October anniversary.

The soiree was attended by Polish President W. Jaruzelski; T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers; M. Rakowski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee; A. Stelmachowski, marshal of the Polish Sejm; representatives of the Polish public; and scientific and cultural figures.

Prague—A ceremonial meeting of working people of the Czechoslovak capital has been held in Prague's Palace of Culture to mark the 72d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. It was attended by M. Jakes, general secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee [CPCZ]; CSSR President G. Husak; CSSR Premier L. Adamec; and other party and state leaders.

The gathering was addressed by I. Knotek, member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

Berlin—W. Krolikowski, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee, addressed a ceremonial session held here to mark the 72d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

We are celebrating this festival with determination to take to a successful conclusion the reorganization which has begun in our countries and to mobilize socialism's moral, spiritual, and material potential. The times require communists, starting with the Central Committee and the Politburo, to strengthen the party in order to organize the process of renewal politically successfully, the speaker said.

Bucharest—The October revolution ushered in a new era in the history of mankind and served as a powerful incentive in the struggle of the peoples and progressive forces for national and social liberation, independence, and freedom. This was declared by C. Pinzaru, minister and secretary of state at the Romanian Ministry of

Foreign Trade and International Economic Cooperation. He was addressing a ceremonial meeting devoted to the 72d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Participating in the meeting were M. Manescu, member of the Romanian Communist Party [RCP] Central Committee Political Executive Committee and deputy chairman of the Romanian State Council; and S. Andrei, candidate member of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee and Romanian deputy prime minister.

Budapest—On the eve of the great October anniversary, newspapers published the appeal of the Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP] to the country's public to participate in celebrating 7 November.

On the morning of 7 November wreaths were laid at the memorial to the Soviet soldier-liberators in Freedom Square. Members of the MSZP Presidium, Hungarian leaders, and representatives of public organizations participated in the wreathlaying. Wreaths were also laid from groups which consider themselves members of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party.

A ceremonial meeting was also held at the Central Board of the Hungarian-Soviet Friendship Society.

Pyongyang—The Great October Socialist Revolution accomplished by Russia's working class under the leadership of V.I. Lenin and the Bolshevist Party was a historic event which ushered in the epoch of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism and illumed mankind's path toward communism, Yi Chong-yul, chairman of the Central Board of the Korean-Soviet Friendship Society and DPRK minister of public health, said on addressing a meeting held here. It was attended by Hong Song-nam, member of the Korean Workers Party [KWP] Central Committee Politburo; Choe Tae-pok, secretary of the KWP Central Committee; and Yang Hyong-sop, chairman of the DPRK Supreme People's Assembly Standing Committee.

Hanoi—The building of a socialist society is the determining trend in mankind's development. This was stated by Do Muoi, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers, at a meeting with the Soviet-Vietnamese international labor collective of Hoa Binh Hydroelectric Power Station to mark the 72d anniversary of great October.

Vientiane—A ceremonial meeting devoted to the 72d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution has been held here. The meeting was addressed by Buatkhong [name as transliterated], chairman of the Central Board of the Lao-Soviet Friendship Society and minister of communications, transport, telecommunications, and construction. Those attending included Oudom Khatti-gna, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee.

Kabul—A ceremonial meeting devoted to the 72d anniversary of great October has been held in the Afghan capital. Addressing it, representatives of Kabul's public emphasized the great significance of October's ideas for the destiny of all mankind. On behalf of the Afghan people the speakers expressed gratitude to the USSR for the disinterested assistance which it has given and is continuing to give friendly Afghanistan at a difficult moment in history for it. [Passage omitted]

Phnom Penh—A ceremonial rally devoted to the 72d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution has been held in the capital of the State of Cambodia. It was attended by Chea Soth, member of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee Politburo and vice chairman of the Council of Ministers, and by other Cambodian leaders. [Passage omitted]

More Greetings

LD0511214889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1320 GMT 5 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow 5 Nov. (TASS)—Telegrams of congratulations and best wishes to the country of the soviets and the Soviet pepole on the occasion of the 72nd anniversary of the Great October Revolution have started to reach the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Council of Ministers, and Comrades M.S. Gorbachev and N.I Ryzhkov.

Telegrams have been sent by:

Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria; and Georgi Atanasov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria;

Rezo Nyers, chairman of the Hungarian Socialist Party; Matyas Szueros, acting president of the Republic of Hungary; and Miklos Nemeth, prime minister of the Council of Ministers of Hungarian Republic;

Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam [SRV]; Vo Chi Cong, chairman of the State Council of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; Do Muoi, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers; and Le Quang Dao, chairman of the National Assembly of the SRV;

Egon Krenz, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and chairman of the State Council of the GDR; and Willi Stoph, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the GDR;

Kim Il-sung, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Labor Party of Korea and president of the Korean People's Democratic Republic; and Yon Hyong-muk, prime minister of the Administrative Council of the DPRK;

Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China; Yang Shangkun, president of the Chinese People's Republic; Li Peng, chairman of the State Council of the PRC; and Wang Li, chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress;

Fidel Castro first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba and chairman of the State Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba;

Jambyn Batmonh, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and chairman of the presidium of the Great People's Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic; and by Dumaagiyn Sodnom, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic;

Mieczyslaw F. Rakowski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Worker's Party; Wojciech Jaruzelski, President of the Polish People's Republic; and Tadeusz Mazowiecki, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Poland;

Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania; and Constantin Dascalescu, prime minister of the Romanian Government;

Milos Jakes, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia; Gustav Husak, president of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic; Alois Indra, chairman of the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly; and Ladislav Adamec, Czechoslovak, prime minister;

Milan Pancevski, president of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia; Janez Drnovsek, president of the Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; and Ante Markovic, president of the Federal Executive Council of the SFRY.

Greetings continue to come in.

Obituary of CEMA Institute Director Shiryayev

PM0811102789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Obituary of Yuriy Semenovich Shiryayev]

[Excerpts] Yuriy Semenovich Shiryayev, CPSU member since 1961, director of the CEMA International Institute of the Economic Problems of the World Socialist System, and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, died suddenly 28 October 1989 aged 57.

Yu.S. Shiryayev—a major economic scientist and a talented organizer—had great scientific and political prestige in the CEMA countries and participated personally in the work to fundamentally restructure cooperation and consolidate the positions of the socialist community countries. [passage omitted]

V.A. Medvedev, N.N. Slyunkov, Ye.M. Primakov, G.I. Marchuk, L.I. Abalkin, V.P. Mozhin, S.A. Sitaryan, V.V. Sychev, A.G. Aganbegyan, G.A. Arbatov, O.T. Bogomolov, S.V. Yemelyanov, I.D. Ivanov, V.N. Kirichenko, B.N. Ladygin, V.A. Martynov, O.K. Rybakov, N.P. Fedorenko, S.N. Shatalin

TASS Reports Gerasimov Press Briefing 9 Nov

UN Decision on Central America

LD0911141289 Moscow TASS in English 1405 GMT 9 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 9 TASS—A senior Soviet spokesman has expressed satisfaction with the U.N. Security Council decision to set up an observer group for Central America. The Security Council endorsed the resolution on November 7.

Gennadiy Gerasimov told a news briefing today that the Soviet Union consistently supported the maximum utilisation of the U.N. peace potential for the political settlement of existing regional conflicts.

This has been confirmed once again during the October visit to Nicaragua by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

Role of Warsaw Pact

LD0911145289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1409 GMT 9 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 9 Nov (TASS)—The pronouncements of official representatives of Western countries, which directly or indirectly, with reservations or without them, speak about a possible response of the Soviet Union to the withdrawal of a particular state from the Warsaw Pact, have become more frequent recently, said Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs at a briefing here today.

At the same time, he pointed out, "a conflicting assessment of the role of the Pact is emerging. On the one hand, it seems that the stabilizing nature of this alliance is recognized, but on the other hand hints are being made which provide evidence of sympathy toward centrifugal trends in it and even their encouragement."

As far as the Soviet side is concerned, Gennadiy Gerasimov stressed, the USSR will continue to strictly observe the Warsaw Treaty. An illustration of a similar position on the part of our allies is their intention to develop multifaceted interaction within the framework of the Warsaw Pact, which was once again reaffirmed at the session of the Foreign Ministers Committee in Warsaw on 26-27 October this year.

The allied countries are consistently coming out in favor of the simultaneous elimination of military-political blocs in Europe. Until this happens they are prepared to build relations between the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic Alliance on a nonconfrontational basis. They do not deny NATO's role as a substantial element in the balance of forces which has developed, but they are calculating on the fact that in the capitals of the member states of the North Atlantic Alliance, too, they recognize the significance of the Warsaw Pact for maintaining stability in Europe, cooperation, and the gradual overcoming of a split on the continent.

New York Chemical Weapons Talks

LD0911145389 Moscow TASS in English 1443 GMT 9 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 9 TASS—Soviet-U.S. consultations on the prohibition of chemical weapons ended in New York on November 7, Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a news briefing here today.

The consultations focused on ways to implement the memorandum of understanding with regard to a bilateral experiment on verification and data exchange in connection with the prohibition of chemical weapons, signed by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker in Wyoming on September 23.

By mutual agreement the consultations will resume in Geneva on November 28, the spokesman said.

Visit of French Foreign Minister

LD0911151689 Moscow TASS in English 1509 GMT 9 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 9 TASS—The official visit to the USSR by French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas between November 13 and 14 accords with the active political dialogue between the two countries, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

Speaking of Dumas' visit, the spokesman stressed that it will be the 12th meeting between the Soviet and French foreign ministers in a year. The sides plan to exchange opinions on international problems. It is probable that the present processes in Europe will feature prominently during the visit.

Gerasimov also said that the ministers might discuss European development on the threshold of the 21st century, the role and place in this development of Soviet-French cooperation.

Work will be continued to improve mutual understanding and, possibly, interaction in advancing the process of disarmament and in settling regional conflicts, he continued.

The ministers will also, presumably, discuss prospects for additional ways of strengthening the legal and contractual basis for relations between the two countries.

Discusses Lebanese Crisis

LD0911152989 Moscow TASS in English 1447 GMT 9 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 9 TASS—"The Soviet Union hails the process that would restore the institutions of state power in friendly Lebanon," the Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

"The solution of the Lebanese crisis, started according to the Arab League Tripartite Committee's plan, is backed actively by the Arab nations and by the international community," he stressed. "This is confirmed unequivocally by the U.N. Security Council chairman's statement of November 7."

"Unfortunately," Gennadiy Gerasimov continued, "there are leaders in Lebanon who ignore this opinion and oppose progress towards national concord. Their attempts to stir up tension again, to set some Lebanese against the overwhelming majority of the population, are quite alarming. They even insult religious leaders who enjoy respect both in Lebanon and Abroad."

"Today, when there is the possibility of overcoming the long- standing crisis, all Lebanese political forces should heed the voice of reason, respect the aspirations of their people and the international community's calls for reconciliation," the Soviet spokesman said.

GDR Events

LD0911154889 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 9 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 9 TASS—"The very important decisions" made by the plenum of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany "should be viewed in connection with the renewal of socialism in the GDR announced by the leadership of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany," USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

He said these decisions are called upon to ensure the implementation of this course. Gerasimov answered numerous questions from reporters connected with events in the GDR. He remarked that events in the GDR are an internal affair of the republic. He added, however, that the USSR is following these events.

The GDR is an "important, one might say, strategic ally" of the USSR, the spokesman said.

Commenting on deliberations in Western press about the possible reunification of Germany, he said, specifically, that this matter "cannot be viewed apart from the overall situation in Europe, which is, as of yet, split into two alliances." He appraised the deliberations in the press an an "occupation not related to practical policy."

If we remain on real ground, any unification of Germany is out of question now, the Soviet diplomat said.

UN To Discuss Possible U.S.-USSR Initiative

LD0811140389 Moscow TASS in English 1331 GMT 8 Nov 89

[Text] New York November 8 TASS—By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Menkes:

It is proposed that the General Committee of the U.N. General Assembly discuss a joint Soviet-American initiative. This is a new item on strengthening international peace, security and international cooperation in all its aspects in line with the U.N. Charter.

It is suggested that the item be put on the agenda of the current 44th U.N. General Assembly. The General Committee will discuss this question today.

This is the first joint Soviet-American initiative at the United Nations. The draft resolution was read out at a joint news conference by Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy and U.S. Assistant Secretary of State John Bolton, which was held at the U.N. headquarters last week.

It was circulated here as an official document of the U.N. General Assembly. The draft resolution calls on all states to multiply their efforts in order to ensure international peace and security in all its aspects with means of cooperation in line with the U.N. Charter.

Justice Minister Speaks at UN Human Rights Forum

LD0811183989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 8 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The 37th session of the UN Human Rights Committee in Geneva has been presented with the USSR report on our country's fulfilment of the international treaty on civil and political rights. [video reportage by V. Dmitriyev opens by showing a meeting in progress; video focuses on USSR Minister of Justice Yakovlev speaking] The committee comprises prominent experts and representatives of 18 states, including the USSR. It keeps an eye on the observance of the provisions of this international treaty by the sides who signed it. The Soviet delegation, headed by USSR Minister of Justice Comrade Yakovlev, participated in the work of the conference and has just held a press conference. [camera shows V.F. Yakovlev speaking to camera]

[Begin Yakovlev recording] The law governed state and its formation is one of the basic tasks in a reform of the political system of our society. And I think that we put this task forward not because someone beyond our country's borders wanted it, but because this is a reflection of our internal requirements. I think that without forming a law governed state, we are essentially unable to successfully resolve any of those large tasks which we have set ourselves—the reform of the political system, and the economic reform—which require a corresponding legal provision, as well as, of course, the development of humane principles of our society, first and foremost in the sphere of human rights and freedoms. This also includes the questions of reliable legal protection, first and foremost the judicial protection of those rights. [end recording]

UN General Assembly Continues To Debate Apartheid

LD0911102689 Moscow TASS in English 0955 GMT 9 Nov 89

[Text] New York November 9 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikolay Maslov:

The 44th session of the U.N. General Assembly continues to debate apartheid in South Africa.

Delegates note that resolutions on apartheid adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council over several years are an important instrument of political pressure on the South African Government and moral support for the national liberation movement in southern Africa.

Nabil al-Mulla, [name as received] acting chairman of the inter-government group on control over oil and petroproducts supplies to South Africa, aid that the oil embargo is one of the most important sanctions of the international community, capable of wiping out apartheid peacefully.

He called on U.N. member states to cooperate and coordinate their efforts to put more effective pressure on Pretoria.

A report submitted by the U.N. commission against apartheid in sports notes that 34 states have ratified and joined the international convention against apartheid in sports.

Commission Chairman James Victor Gbeho pointed to the importance of using the register of sport contacts with South Africa for the isolation of Pretoria. The register is annually published by the U.N. special committee against apartheid.

The chairman called on all sportsmen whose names are listed in the register, as well as on several international sport federations to sever relations with South Africa and join its boycott.

It is self-evident that apartheid is the most obnoxious form of racism, which is practiced by a state and which is based on the negation and suppression of human dignity, said Lakin Kayumov, representive of the Soviet delegation and foreign minister of the Soviet Tadzhik Republic.

"We resolutely condemn apartheid which is a crude violation of the aims and principles of the U.N. Charter, the provisions of the universal declaration of human rights. It is the prime cause of violence and tension in Southern Africa," he continued.

Kayumov noted that in the recent past pretoria repeatedly stated its intention to steer things to a stage-by-stage elimination of apartheid and declared its desire to write a "new chapter" in South Africa's history.

However, the analysis of present-day realities shows that its authorities have not begun radical changes and have not taken steps to do away with apartheid.

Hundred of political prisoners are still in jail in South Africa, including Nelson Mandela, a leader of the African National Congress (ANC).

The Soviet Union supports the demands of the international community for the unconditional and immediate release of Mandela and other prisoners, a repeal of the ban on the activities of political and democratic organisations, trade union movements of black population, an end to reprisals, repeal of the state of emergency and implementation of just demands put forth by the ANC and other progressive forces in the country, the Soviet delegate said.

The Soviet Union backs the call of the General Assembly on the Security Council to impose all-embracing mandatory sanctions against South Africa in line with Chapter 7 of the U.N. Charter.

The USSR again confirmed at the United Nations its intention to actively support U.N. efforts aimed at eliminating apartheid in South Africa.

"We are sure that the day will come when South Africa will ensure conditions for the free and equal development of all ethnic and racial groups, and the country will occupy a prestigious place in the international arena, enriching the ideas of friendship, world- wide cooperation and lasting peace," Kayumov stressed.

Asia-Pacific Economic Forum Plan Discussed

PM0811204189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 6

[I. Kovalev commentary: "The Idea Has Been Accepted, But..."]

[Text] "An idea whose time has come," U.S. Secretary of State James Baker declared, thus giving the "green light" to the Australian initiative to establish the so-called Asia-Pacific Economic Forum (APEF) with the participation of Australia, the United States, Japan, Canada, New Zealand, South Korea and the six ASEAN countries. All these countries have accepted the invitation of Prime Minister R. Hawke of Australia to send their ministers to the first meeting in Canberra.

You may wonder: Is the "Hawke initiative" for creating yet another mechanism for consultations and talks in Asia and the Pacific region really necessary since similar mechanisms already exist in this region?

Here is what London's FINANCIAL TIMES has to say in this context: "More than one-third of all world trade is now concentrated in Asia and the Pacific region, and during the years through the end of the century the region will produce more than one-half of the world's economic output. However, the region still does not have a formal institution to determine the degree of efficiency and the needs of economic cooperation." The rapid development of the international division of labor and increasing economic interdependence in the Pacific region are prompting the establishment of new structures for consultations and cooperation.

These are the general motives. As for the individual interests of the future participants in the Canberra meeting, they are very wide-ranging. Let us begin with Australia, the initiator of the forum. R. Hawke, judging by appearances, is afraid that in the emerging system of trade blocs his country may find itself isolated. The signing in January of a U.S.-Canadian agreement on free trade is fraught with the establishment of a North American trade bloc; and the 12 countries of the EEC are forming a single market. The uncertainty about the future direction of U.S. trade policy in conditions where there is mounting pressure on the administration to make this policy more protectionist is also causing concern.

U.S. favor toward the Australian initiative is explained by objective factors: By 1988 the volume of U.S. trade in the so-called "Pacific Rim" totaled $271 billion, thus greatly exceeding the volume of transatlantic trade ($186 billion). There are eight major markets for U.S. goods in the Pacific region. Of course, THE WASHINGTON POST writes that the main factor remains unchanged: "The United States intends to preserve its leading role in the Pacific region, despite Japan's economic might."

Japan, having tried in vain in previous years to push through its scenarios for establishing a common economic community mechanism in Asia and the Pacific region, has greeted the APEF as an at present entirely acceptable option. It is even advantageous for Japan that it itself is not the initiator of the new plan because if the initiative came from Japan it might again scare off many countries which still recall the Japanese "coprosperity sphere" during World War II and are afraid of Japanese economic domination.

The Japanese in principle do not seek to transform any regional grouping into a trade bloc. Even without that, they conduct their trade and economic affairs in the region successfully. Japan accounts for more than 60 percent of total trade in the region and Japan is already ahead of the United States in terms of capital investment in Asia and the Pacific region. In the 12 months preceding March of the current year, alone, Japan's investments totaled $5.6 billion. At the same time the creation of structures on the lines of APEF may, in the opinion of former Japanese Foreign Minister Saburo Okita, induce the EEC and the United States to desist from adopting a protectionist policy. R. Hawke's idea also fully fits in with Japanese policy, which the London weekly THE ECONOMIST defined as follows: "The preservation of stability and of the capitalist system in a region which provides raw materials, enterprises, and, to an increasing extent, markets for Japanese industry."

The ASEAN countries have agreed to become part of APEF, recognizing the realities of interdependence, but expressing considerable reservations. Here are the main ones: Pacific economic cooperation must be based on independence, mutual respect, and equality; it must complement rather than supplant existing multilateral mechanisms of cooperation; cooperation via APEF must not lead to the creation of a trade and economic bloc.

These principles are of exceptional importance for Indonesia and Malaysia, which depend to a considerable degree on exports of raw materials on preferential terms within GATT.

Singapore believes that the forum should be invested only with consultative functions. A bloc system is unacceptable for Singapore since, according to specialists on regional economics and politics, Singapore sees itself as a "subcenter of the whole of Southeast Asia in the future Asia and Pacific Region economic system." The same specialists believe that Thailand aims at playing the role of an "economic subcenter of Indochina," which would be infeasible if Bangkok was drawn into a closed community. Subsequently, according to the Australian organizers, representatives of the PRC, Taiwan, and Hong Kong are to be invited to the forum. To the question "What about the Soviet Union?" they replied that this cannot be ruled out.

So thus far, it seems, our country has been "forgotten." The explanation given for this stance is that, allegedly, the USSR is not yet a significant economic force in the Pacific region and that, moreover, its economic system does not "fit in" with the free market system. However, it is more likely that the political and ideological stereotypes of former years have essentially not yet been overcome.

So the meeting in Canberra is drawing near. Will it be a constituent congress, as it were, to establish an organization with a guiding mechanism or a forum for expanded consultations? What political objectives will predominate at this forum? In a few days' time this will become clearer.

European Ecology Forum in Sofia Called 'Success'

PM0811161089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
8 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[Leonid Zhmyrev dispatch under the rubric "Correspondent Comments": "Ecology: Europe's Path"]

[Text] Sofia—"Success despite the lack of consensus"—this is the phrase political observers and participants are using to assess the results of the Sofia forum on ecology, which has just ended.

On the last day of the meeting, when the concluding debates on the adoption of the final document were in progress, a representative of the Romanian delegation declared disagreement with some provisions of the text of the introductory section.

Should we dramatize the situation? I think not. After all, according to the mandate for the forum the signing of a final protocol is not compulsory. The sides wanted to demonstrate unity of goodwill, even given the fact that national interests do not coincide. This could not be achieved procedurally, but this does not by any means negate the recommendations and conclusions of the ecoforum's working bodies or their significance for the further galvanization of European cooperation in the ecological sphere.

In accordance with the results of the meeting there was support, in particular, for the idea of a so-called framework convention on restricting pollution of cross-border waters and international lakes, as well as other conventions connected with averting the effects of industrial accidents and the utilization of dangerous chemicals. Consensus was reached on the need to draw up legal documents on nature conservation activity in Europe and to standardize national legislation.

Assessing the results of the meeting, Academician Mako Dakov, chairman of the Bulgarian national committee of the movement for conservation and reproduction of the natural environment, expressed support for the participation of social and nongovernmental organizations in the forum:

"The development of ecological culture and glasnost, the creation of an atmosphere of intolerance toward those who violate the ecological equilibrium, the struggle to improve working and leisure conditions—that is the range of tasks they can and should tackle," he noted in conversation. "Several parallel conferences held at the ecoforum with the participation of social organizations proved very impressive. They brought together some 500 scientists and experts from various countries, including the USSR."

Here are the final impressions of USSR People's Deputy A. Pinyagin, member of the Soviet Committee for Ecology and Rational Utilization of Resources:

"The European ecoforum gave a boost to the revision of nature conservation activity at home, too. Formerly we used to talk about political economy, but now for the first time we have heard the term 'political ecology,' and are beginning to take it on board. Our study of the practice of development of legislation in the environmental conservation sphere in other European countries was instructive for us. International legislation, for instance, formulates the problem of human rights in a new way; this problem cannot be viewed in isolation from ecology. We attach great significance to the implementation of the agreement between the USSR and Bulgaria in the sphere of ecology which was signed at the forum. The document makes provision, in particular, for the joint construction of nature conservation facilities, mutual assistance in eliminating the consequences of accidents, and nuclear power station safety measures."

The Sofia ecology meeting, taking the baton from Helsinki, Madrid, Stockholm, and Vienna, was an important step along the path to more resolute actions to avert the ecological threat. It helped to unite efforts in this important area by the states and peoples living on the old continent.

Balkan Ministers Discuss Trade at Bucharest Forum

PM0711140289 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Nov 89 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent V. Vedrashko report: "Dialogue Will Continue"]

[Text] Bucharest—A 3-day meeting of representatives of the Balkan states—Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Romania, Turkey, and Yugoslavia—was held in Bucharest. Deputy ministers of foreign trade and foreign economic relations examined the main spheres of mutual interest and the development of cooperation.

During the exchange of opinions they discussed, in particular, the need to step up contacts between the chambers of trade and industry of the six countries. It is planned to discuss in the near future questions connected with the creation of a Balkan chamber of trade and industry and the holding of a regional fair. In this connection certain representatives put forward interesting proposals on, for instance, the investment policy of such a joint chamber and the organizing of "roundtables" and seminars on particular topics at fairs. The conference participants did not ignore the problem of customs barriers. As yet there are no decisions on this point, they are still to be sought.

As was noted at the Bucharest meeting, the logic of cooperation gives rise to the need for joint work on problems of banking affairs and finance. It is proposed to hold consultations among experts, who would examine the possibility of creating particular types of machine-building output on the basis of production sharing.

It is not ruled out that scope could open up in future for joint efforts in chemicals, petrochemicals, electronics, and electrical equipment. But in the opinion of some participants in the meeting production sharing would already be realistic in the sphere of agriculture and food production and sales. The delegates also came out in favor of setting up an arbitration mechanism.

The results of the Bucharest meeting received a unanimous assessment: A constructive step was taken toward strengthening Balkan cooperation. Stefan Stancu, Romanian deputy minister of foreign trade and international economic cooperation, noted in a talk with journalists that whereas formerly the sides were talking about the benefits of cooperation in general and in principle, now the actual mechanism for such collaboration is beginning to be developed and the possibilities of creating joint organs for the implementation of mutually beneficial economic projects are being examined. It is necessary to work patiently and not rush things, and then positive results will undoubtedly be achieved, the Romanian representative stated.

Indeed, in the Balkans, as everywhere, haste or a careless step could do damage. Some states are outside the military-political groupings—the Warsaw Pact and NATO—while others bleong to them. There are plenty of problems in bilateral relations, too. In view of all this, a number of delegates noted the positive influence of Balkan economic cooperation on the political climate in the region.

But the following conclusion is also logical: The normalization of the political climate on a Europe-wide scale will help to eliminate the major and minor problems in the Balkans, which are at present objective problems for the region's countries. It is because of these that the frequent Balkan meetings of recent times—there have been three this year in Bucharest alone—are not yet, in my view, producing tangible practical results. Hence, too, the different assessments of their results. A member of the Bulgarian delegation told me that "more was achieved than we expected" in Bucharest. But his Yugoslav colleague said: "The pace we are moving at cannot be called satisfactory."

The next regional meeting at ministerial level will be in Athens in the near future.

New Research Center To Study Mediterranean

PM0911102389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Report on interview with V. Zhurkin, chairman of the Mediterranean Research Center Council under the USSR Academy of Sciences Europe Institute, by M. Kozhukhov: "Political Science, and More Besides"—date and place of interview not stated]

[Text] A Mediterranean Research Center has been created in Moscow under the USSR Academy of Sciences Europe Institute.

Its purpose is to implement and coordinate fundamental and applied research on Mediterranean problems that is being carried out in our country. It goes without saying that questions of strengthening regional security and cooperation will have an important place in this research, but the newly formed center's sphere of interests will not just comprise traditional, "dry" political science.

"The Mediterranean is a special region combining many different South European and North African countries at a meeting point between the two continents. Their experience in the most varied spheres may be useful in the building of a new 'common European home,'" V. Zhurkin, chairman of the center's council and USSR Academy of Sciences member and correspondent, noted in a conversation with IZVESTIYA correspondent M. Kozhukhov. "The Mediterranean is also considered to be the cradle of European civilization: The gaze of scientists concerned with searching for humanitarian, historical, and cultural roots common to all of us, is turned here."

Soviet researchers are ready to participate in the joint solution of problems in this region, for example, in the sphere of ecology or sea transport safety, V. Zhurkin believes, and the results of such work may be of an applied nature and promote a solution to our own acute problems.

According to the intentions of its founders, who include large academic institutes and social organizations, the Mediterranean Research Center is capable of becoming another instrument uniting Soviet and West European scientists, politicians, social workers, and art critics, promoting the expansion of contacts between them, and helping in the final dismantling of the notorious "Iron Curtain."

United States & Canada

Bush Previews December Talks with Gorbachev

OW0911134389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1125 GMT 9 Nov 89

[From the "World Today" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Text] U.S. President George Bush spoke at a press conference timed to mark the anniversary of his election to the high post. I will remind you, as well, that he assumed the office almost 10 months ago.

So, Bush declared that he was satisfied with the work of his Administration, in particular in the sphere of international relations. The President named a number of peace initiatives proposed by his administration.

Touching upon his meeting with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, in early this December, the President declared that he intended to discuss with the Soviet leader a reduction of military budgets of the two countries, as well as the role of the United States and the Soviet Union in solving regional problems, in particular the problem of Nicaragua.

December Summit Termed 'Intermediate' Meeting

LD0911114189 Moscow TASS in English 1114 GMT 9 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 9 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

The announcement that the Soviet and American presidents will meet in the Mediterranean in December prompted much interest throughout the world.

There has been much speculation among analysts as to what impelled George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev to agree to meet precisely at this time.

The outgoing year has been one of the stormiest in the entire post-war period. The rapid and in many respects unexpected turns in the development of events in a number of regions of the world have more than once called for responsible and difficult decisions and at the same time compelled the heads of leading countries to take into account the interests of one another.

This is why the contact which the Soviet Union and the United States maintained at the political level was so important.

There were exchanges of messages between the two countries' leaders and a substantive dialogue at foreign minister level.

However, there is no substitute for face-to-face talks and a substantive detailed discussion of the entire spectrum of problems in an atmosphere of informal and frank contacts.

Due to the breakthroughs in Wyoming, conditions are taking shape for an official summit in Washington to be marked by major accords capable of influencing the course of world affairs for decades to come.

There are grounds to hope in particular that agreements on three key problems of disarmament—a 50 per cent cut in strategic offensive armaments, a reduction in conventional armed forces and a ban on chemical weapons—may be signed next year.

But these achievements would not come by themselves. They may be promoted by an overall atmosphere of stability and normal evolution unburdened by old confrontational approaches.

A well-considered and responsible line in the policies of all countries, particularly the Soviet Union and the United States, will be needed, just as specific impulses to undo the remaining knots at the negotiations.

So, Gorbachev and Bush will have many subjects for discussion, both general and specific. This is what, it seems, prompted them to decide on an intermediate meeting on the way to an official summit.

Zagladin on Gorbachev-Bush Meeting

PM0811153489 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 7 Nov 89 p 5

[Interview with "Gorbachev adviser" Vadim Zagladin by Ezio Mauro; date, place not given]

[Excerpt] Moscow—[Passage omitted] [Mauro] Vadim Valentinovich, why have Gorbachev and Bush suddenly decided to meet, independently of any negotiating commitments and scheduled appointments?

[Zagladin] I can tell you that it was President Bush's initiative. I believe that the U.S. Administration had a long time to ponder it: The time had come for it to make a decision. There have long been splits among them with regard to relations with the USSR. I believe that everyone now is agreed on the need to develop these relations.

[Mauro] What is the reason for this turnabout?

[Zagladin] There are several reasons. On the one hand the Americans perceive a very rapid development of the situation in the USSR, and on the other they are assessing our serious difficulties in the face of the economic crisis. So it is entirely normal for Bush to want to know what is happening in Moscow, not only from his ambassador's reports but directly from Gorbachev's own mouth. Furthermore the decision to hold this meeting was also inevitably influenced by the changes in Eastern Europe.

[Mauro] Why have they weakened the USSR?

[Zagladin] There is a different reason for this. Until very recently the Americans were waiting to see how we would behave in connection with what was happening in

Budapest and Warsaw. They reckoned that Moscow could exert some kind of pressure and wanted to see whether the so-called Brezhnev doctrine still applied. We have not only proclaimed the complete freedom of choice of all countries but also displayed an understanding attitude toward the processes developing in Eastern Europe. As far as I know, this has helped to unblock the situation. Moreover, bear in mind that the real summit takes place in May and that, though Bush has known Gorbachev for years, as "second-in-command" he never participated directly in negotiations with him, so it is logical for him to want to get to know his opposite number better before embarking on negotiations. The same goes for Gorbachev, too.

[Mauro] Can you say how long you have been working on this meeting?

[Zagladin] I can disclose that the issue was raised months ago. I would add that it was discussed at the Wyoming meeting between Shevardnadze and Baker, but no decision was made.

[Mauro] Does the crisis in Eastern Europe not threaten to change the entire picture of East-West negotiations?

[Zagladin] In my opinion, we should talk not in terms of a crisis in Eastern Europe but in terms of a model of socialism that the majority of those peoples want to change.

[Mauro] Do you not believe that that model should be given a name?

[Zagladin] Let us do so, by all means: We could call it Stalinist. But the important thing is not the name: It is the fact that the model is being abandoned in several countries and in various ways. We realize that this process is normal, and in fact necessary, and its forms are determined by the various peoples, because our perestroyka cannot be exported in this way. So for us there is no problem if those peoples want to build a new model of socialism. Of course we want those countries to remain friends and allies. But it seems to me that the Polish and Hungarian Governments are saying the same thing.

[Mauro] You say that there is no problem, but is the very conception of communism not entering a crisis in Eastern Europe?

[Zagladin] I believe, rather, that what is happening is a development of that conception. It is not dead, and will survive—in our country, in those countries, and in the West, too. Rather, the processes under way could conceal certain elements of destabilization, such as certain statements by FRG representatives. Our shared task, in both the East and the West, is to avert them.

[Mauro] The impression is that the Kremlin saw in John Paul II's pontificate, first, a destabilizing threat to its imperial certainties and, later, a factor in possible European stability. How, when, and why did your attitude toward the pope change?

[Zagladin] First, the pope's position has developed throughout this period, and it is still developing. Now the Vatican's stances on humanitarian issues, on peace, the environment, and development are not only interesting to us, but acceptable in the vast majority of cases. This is why we want to develop relations with this pope, who now holds very interesting stances on the issues of world development. There is not agreement on all issues, but this applies to relations with any state. The important thing is this: There are very many viewpoints in which the USSR is now close to Pope John Paul II, and this was not so in the past.

[Mauro] There remains the problem of the Uniate Church: Is it true that the Kremlin is unable to surmount the resistance of the Orthodox Church?

[Zagladin] This is a matter for the churches, not our state. Your question should be put to the Orthodox Church.

[Mauro] But following Gorbachev's visit to the Vatican will diplomatic relations be established between Moscow and the Vatican and will the pope then be able to visit the USSR?.

[Zagladin] With regard to your first question, let us wait and see what Gorbachev and the pope have to say. As for a visit to the USSR, I believe that the pope will come—in fact I am sure of it, though I cannot make any forecasts about when. But if we develop our relations, I do not see why this visit should not take place: It would be entirely normal.

[Mauro] Why has it taken 70 years for a general secretary to meet with the pope?

[Zagladin] This is not the right question, because, as you know, this idea was inconceivable until 1985. So let us say that it has taken 4 years of perestroyka. It does not seem to me that we have wasted much time.

[Mauro] What is Gorbachev seeking from his visit to Italy?

[Zagladin] We want deeper and wider-ranging cooperation, not only in trade but also in industry, science, and technology. There is a certain tradition, an experience, with Italy. We were the first to reach certain major agreements together, such as Togliattigrad and the gas accord. We must again be the first in the world to invent something new. We are ready for it.

[Mauro] The USSR now finds as prime minister in Rome a man with whom it has always had a special relationship. What is the basis of this system of relations between Moscow and Andreotti?

[Zagladin] Mr Andreotti is a genuine, a great politician, with a great deal of realism and the ability to formulate new ideas. He is not an easy interlocutor, but he is trustworthy. He knows how to listen: With him nothing that is said is ever wasted.

[Mauro] Why is your assessment so different from the Italian Communist Party's [PCI]?

[Zagladin] Perhaps because we are a long way away. But it seems to me that although the PCI criticizes the government's domestic policy, there is broad agreement on foreign policy.

[Mauro] As you know, the PCI's "pro-Soviets" accuse [PCI Secretary General Achille] Occhetto of abandoning communism, whereas the Socialists are urging him to make a sharper break with the past. From Moscow's vantage point, what is the nature of Italian communism?

[Zagladin] Mr Occhetto is someone who I like very much. I find him courageous and entirely undogmatic. He is trying to find something new to make his party an equal member of the Italian democratic community, but with a role of its own. It is a very major endeavor that deserves success.

[Mauro] So was Berlinguer right at the time of the "wrench"?

[Zagladin] It depends on how you interpret those assessments of his. If he was condemning the old Stalinist model, he was right. If he considered the October Revolution's thrust exhausted, then he was not, as is shown by the birth of perestroyka.

[Mauro] Craxi's Italian Socialist Party is asking that the revision of communist history include Togliatti, too. What do you think?

[Zagladin] I do not want to express an opinion on Mr Craxi's relations with the other Italian forces, but I must say that he is a very interesting leader, whom we want to work with, and our viewpoints on many international issues coincide. As for Togliatti, I will be frank: He was a very great figure, who may have committed certain errors, but this is a matter for the Italian comrades. As far as we are concerned, he made a major contribution to the PCI's development, was one of the founders of the Italian Republic, and did his utmost to avert civil war in Italy by seeking an alliance with all the democratic forces.

[Mauro] Vadim Valentinovich, Gorbachev is about to arrive in Italy at a time when some people in the USSR are urging him to become a reformist dictator in order to salvage perestroyka. Will there be an "iron first" in the Kremlin?

[Zagladin] We are witnessing many thrusts in this direction, because we have not resolved the following problem: democratic coexistence and discipline. But we do not want authoritarianism and returns to the past. This is why we want to develop the rule-of-law state and to create a system of rules. It is not central government but law that must create law. And the state must have more strength, but it must be granted strength by the law.

Orlov Delegation Observes Virginia Election

PM0911101389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS correspondent A. Fedyashin dispatch: "Delegation's Stay"]

[Text] Richmond (Virginia), 8 Nov—The polling place located in a primary school in the outskirts of Richmond opened early yesterday morning not only for U.S. voters but also for representatives of the USSR. Members of the delegation of the Central Electoral Commission for Elections of USSR People's Deputies headed by V.P. Orlov, its chairman, were visiting it. They are touring the United States at the invitation of the Federal Election Commission. The election of the state governor is taking place in Virginia today.

"We specially chose a very ordinary polling place for our colleagues to visit," T. Josefiak, member of the Federal Commission, said in conversation with the TASS correspondent. "There are thousands of these in the country. A very widespread device—a lever machine—is used in them when voting."

Americans vote without the paper ballots which are usual in many countries. The voter approaches a special display board with the candidates' names, screened by drapes, finds the button opposite the name of the person he has chosen, and "votes" by pressing a special lever, while the candidate's automatic counter registers one more vote. The system rules out ballot papers and, consequently, the possibility of cheating or machinations with them. At 0600 in the morning, the time the polling places open, the lever machine's counters were set to zero and sealed in the presence of representatives of the state election commission and the candidates. In the evening, at 1900, after voting has ended, the data will be removed from them.

On the same day the members of the Soviet delegation met with Gerald Baliles, the present governor of Virginia.

China

Heilongjiang Delegation To Visit RSFSR

OW0511003789 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 3 Nov 89

[From the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Let us talk about Soviet-Chinese cooperation. There are increasingly close contacts between certain regions of the Soviet Union and China. For example, a delegation from China's Heilongjiang Province, headed by Shao Qihui, governor of the Heilongjiang Provincial People's Government, will visit the Soviet Union on 11 November at the invitation of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. The following is a report in this regard by our reporter [name indistinct]:

[Reporter] Heilongjiang Province is one of our major cooperative Chinese partners as indicated by the following facts: Heilongjiang accounts for approximately 60 percent of the total volume covered by the economic and trade agreements signed between the Soviet Union and China. The contracts signed between Heilongjiang's enterprises and their Soviet partners since 1988 have amounted to more than 1 billion Swiss francs. The forthcoming visit by the delegation of the Heilungjiang Provincial People's Government will assist in developing cooperation between Heilongjiang Province and the RSFSR.

RSFSR Foreign Minister Vinogradov has the following comments on this.

[Begin Vinogradov recording in Russian fading into Mandarin translation] This will be the first visit by a Chinese provincial governor to the RSFSR. Great possibilities exist for bilateral cooperation. China has made proposals to us for setting up joint ventures to make television sets, seismographs, computers, and other products. At present, one such enterprise—the (?Omsk Electronics Plant)—has been established and begun production. [end recording]

According to the plan, the delegation from China's Heilongjiang Province is scheduled to arrive in Khabarovsk on 11 November. It will visit some cities in the Far East and in Siberia. Before the conclusion of the visit, Heilongjiang Provincial Governor Shao Qihui will hold talks with RSFSR Council of Ministers Chairman Vlasov in Moscow. This radio station will broadcast timely reports on this visit.

More on Beijing Reception for October Revolution

PM0711160589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[From TASS 6 November roundup under general heading: "Embodying Lenin's Ideas"]

[Text] Beijing—The Chinese People's Society for Friendship with Foreign Countries and the Sino-Soviet Friendship Society today gave a reception which was attended by Chinese People's Society for Friendship with Foreign Countries Chairman Han Xu, Sino-Soviet Friendship Society Chairman Wu Xiuquan, leaders of a number of central ministries and departments, and O.A. Troyanovskiy, USSR ambassador to the PRC.

The victory of the socialist revolution accomplished under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party headed by V.I. Lenin, Han Xu said, changed not only the destiny of Russia but also the face of the whole world. Over the past decades the Soviet people have achieved tremendous successes through their creative labor.

The May summit meeting in Beijing, which marked the all-around normalization of relations between the two great neighboring countries, he emphasized, was a new landmark in the history of traditional Sino-Soviet friendship. Today, too, we are pleased to note the broadening of PRC-USSR contacts taking place in all spheres.

Academy Fires Fang Lizhi for Role in June Unrest

PM0811144389 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "China: Dismissed From Post"]

[Text] XINHUA reports taht by the decision of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, the Chinese astrophysicist Fang Lizhi, who "engaged in criminal agitation and incitement during the disorders and counterrevolutionary revolt in Beijing," has been relieved of his position as senior scientific associate at the Beijing Observatory.

Since the June events, Fang Lizhi and his wife have taken refuge in the U.S. Embassy in the PRC.

Fan Lizhi was the recipient of the Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights Award this October. China condemned the U.S. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Committee's decision, describing it as open support for Fang Lizhi's criminal activity, gross interference in China's internal affairs, and a provocation to the Chinese people. The country's press continues to publish articles sharply critical of the "instigators" of the antigovernment actions in May-June. In an article in yesterday's RENMIN RIBAO they were described as "national traitors" and "advocates of national nihilism who completely denied all the Chinese nation's gains."

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Visit To Ease Tensions in Region

OW0711135989 Tokyo KYODO in English 1301 GMT 7 Nov 89

[Text] Tokyo, Nov. 7 KYODO—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Japan in 1991 should help ease tensions in the Asia-Pacific region, Soviet ambassador to Japan Nikolay Solovyev said in a published message Tuesday.

"We have no doubts that the Tokyo summit will be crucial not only from the viewpoint of bilateral relations, but also from the point of view of ameliorating the rather complicated situation in Asia and the Pacific," Solovyev said.

The Soviet ambassador's message was published in THE JAPAN TIMES, an English-language daily, to commemorate the 72nd anniversary of the Communist rise to power in the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution.

Gorbachev's long-anticipated visit to Japan, which will be the first ever by a Soviet leader, was set for 1991 in a meeting last September between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his Japanese counterpart Taro Nakayama.

"We hope that the concerted effort of the two sides will help crown Mikhail Gorbachev's visit with beneficial results in keeping with the visit's historical importance," the ambassador said.

Solovyev called Gorbachev's decision to visit Japan "clear proof" of the sincerity of the Soviet determination to improve relations with Japan.

Relations between Tokyo and Moscow have been strained for decades over the Soviet Union's occupation of four Japanese-claimed northern islands off Hokkaido immediately after World War II.

Japan is hoping that Gorbachev's visit will result in a return of the islands, while the Soviets are anxious to enlist Japanese support in developing the Soviet economy, especially in the Soviet Far East.

Y. Shipov, a senior official of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, in a similar message published in the MAINICHI DAILY NEWS, lamented the "stagnation" of Soviet-Japanese trade in the 1980s.

Shipov said the stagnation was due to "political strains," an apparent allusion to the territorial issue, as well as the fact that Soviet exports consist mainly of fuel and primary materials, which are sensitive to global price fluctuations.

"Bilateral economic cooperation could develop at a faster pace if it weren't contained by the Japanese idea of politics as being inseparable from economics," Shipov said.

"This philosophy not only impedes Soviet-Japanese relations at the government level, but also restrains the initiative of Japanese firms prepared to collaborate with Soviet enterprises in different projects," he said.

Shipov said outstanding bilateral political issues would be more easily resolved if progress were made in the economic arena.

He said the Soviet Union is nevertheless optimistic that bilateral business relations "may be elevated to a new level," and encouraged the conclusion of joint projects that would yield returns in the long run.

Sakharov Visits Hiroshima, Speaks on Perestroyka

OW0411142089 Tokyo KYODO in English 1208 GMT 4 Nov 89

[Text] Hiroshima, Nov. 4 KYODO—Soviet physicist and human rights activist Andrey Sakharov toured the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum dedicated to the city's atomic bomb victims on Saturday and said a similar museum for those killed and persecuted by Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin was needed in his homeland.

The 68-year-old Sakharov, who won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1975, toured the museum with his wife Yelena Bonner, also used the occasion to urge nations to seek a reduction in strategic nuclear weapons and an end to political conflicts which could result in war.

When he came to a picture depicting piles of victims of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima in early August 1945, Sakharov said he wants to build a similar memorial facility for those killed by Stalin but the government has been unwilling to endorse the idea.

Sakharov has been in Japan since October 25 to attend the second Nobel laureates forum held in Tokyo and Sapporo.

In a panel discussion later in the day, Sakharov said his visit to Hiroshima was obligatory for him because he has engaged in development of nuclear weapons.

The forum, held at a municipal auditorium, was attended by some 600 citizens, including A-bomb survivors.

Sakharov referred to the perestroyka (reconstruction) drive now under way in his country and Eastern Europe, as well as international reactions to China's military crackdown on the pro-democracy movement in June, and called for stronger solidarity among people beyond national borders.

The trend toward global unity and interdependence is growing, regardless of differences in nationality or color of skin, he said.

Concerning developments in his own country, Sakharov said all political and economic power is held by the Communist Party despite propaganda that the Soviet system is in the interests of all the people.

He said perestroyka has gradually brought changes in the social structure, but not enough to live up to the people's expectations. The party's authority is losing ground and people's dissatisfaction is growing as a result, he said.

Faster strides should be made in reforms, including those in the political field, Sakharov said.

Leaves Japan for Home

OW0811061189 Tokyo KYODO in English 0537 GMT 8 Nov 89

[Text] Narita, Chiba Pref., Nov. 8 KYODO—Soviet Nobel Prize Laureate Andrey Sakharov left Japan for home on Wednesday after a 15-day visit.

The 68-year-old nuclear physicist and his wife Yelena Bonner had arrived in Japan on October 25 to attend the second Nobel-laureate forum of five prize winners held in Tokyo and Hiroshima.

During his stay, the 1975 Nobel Peace Prize winner also met with Emperor Akihito and Empress Michiko, together with other Nobel Prize winners attending the forum.

Sakharov, a prominent Soviet dissident, also visited the Atomic-bomb Memorial Museum in Hiroshima last Saturday, saying a visit to Hiroshima was obligatory for him as someone who had helped develop nuclear weapons.

Mission To Study Japanese Government Economic Role

OW0611081089 Tokyo KYODO in English
0623 GMT 6 Nov 89

[Text] Tokyo, Nov. 6 KYODO—The leader of a Soviet economic survey mission said in Tokyo on Monday that the Soviet Union wants to harmoniously promote central planning while introducing market mechanisms and is looking at the Japanese Government's role in developing Japan's economy.

Communist Party official Anatoliy Milyukov, head of the 10-member economic delegation, told Foreign Ministry officials in a two-hour session that his country wishes to enhance its development by bringing market mechanisms into play.

But he added that it also wishes to carry out central planning as effectively as possible.

In that light, Milyukov said the mission wishes to study how the Japanese Government has successfully administered the country's economic development through close ties with industry and other elements of the private sector.

The delegation leader said that perestroyka in the Soviet Union, which began as a general concept, has reached a stage where concrete mechanisms are under consideration.

Michihiko Kunihiro, former deputy foreign minister for economic affairs, in his reply to Milyukov, downplayed the Japanese Government's role in managing the economy.

He said that Japan's postwar economy is witnessing a major shift away from being a regulated economy to one directed by the free economic activities of the private sector.

Kunihiro noted that Japan's bureaucratic mechanism, as a ratio of its population, is the smallest among the world's advanced industrialized nations.

Despite the image overseas of a "Japan, Inc.," there is severe domestic competition among industries, he stressed.

Kunihiro said that besides looking at ties between government and industry, the Soviet delegation should observe during their 10-day stay the role of the consumer as a "new and difficult" element in the economic picture.

He also suggested that the Soviet visitors keep in mind the influence that a lack of natural resources has had on Japan's choice of economic paths.

Koichi Haraguchi, deputy director general of the ministry's Economic Affairs Bureau, noted that the Japanese word for crisis, "kiki," consists of two ideographs, one representing danger and the other opportunity.

He said that Japan has successfully sought out opportunity amidst dangers, such as the two oil crises and the recent high yen.

In light of Japan's rising gross national product (GNP) and its large surpluses with its overseas trading partners, Haraguchi said that a major challenge now confronting Japan is responding to the stern global attention now focussed on it.

He said Japan is taking various steps to assure that the world can harmoniously absorb the impact of Japan's economic development.

The Soviet delegation also paid a call on Vice Foreign Minister Takakazu Kuriyama, who said he hopes the delegation's visit will have a beneficial effect on overall Japan-Soviet relations.

[Tokyo KYODO in English at 0623 GMT on 6 November adds: "[The] Soviet economic delegation arrived in Tokyo Sunday..."]

U.S. Resistance Hampers Pacific Naval Disarmament

OW0911023489 Moscow in Japanese to Japan
1000 GMT 6 Nov 89

[Dmitriyev commentary—from the "New Thinking and the Contemporary World" Program]

[Text] According to a report released by the U.S. antiwar group working for naval disarmament, Pacific Campaign, on 3 November, the U.S. Navy has compiled a handbook on ports in the Asia and Pacific region for its officers. The handbook contains information, not only on military ports but also on ports for purely civilian use. Topping the list of ports of interest to the U.S. Navy are 31 Japanese ports, including Yokohama, Nagasaki, Kobe, and even Beppu and Atami. The handbook provides information on tide tables, navigational conditions, and support facilities on each port. For instance, looking at the entry on Nagasaki, there is information saying two destroyers or one cruiser can enter the port at one time, but there is no mention whatsoever of the fact that Nagasaki suffered from atomic bombing by the United States in the history of the port. From the above, we can conclude that the U.S. Navy considers the bases it now uses to be insufficient and intends to make use of ports other than its bases under conditions it deems to be suitable. Naturally, it intends to use these ports under the principle of neither negating nor confirming the carriage of nuclear weapons.

Furthermore, the U.S. antiwar group's report on the Navy's handbook also revealed a noteworthy point in naval disarmament. Many people in Japan have also shown interest in this issue. For instance, the Japan Socialist Party has consistently raised this question. Japanese newspapers also show great concern for the naval arms race. For instance, in an article on the September meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State Baker, ASAHI SHIMBUN wrote that, although Soviet compromise on the naval cruise missile was beneficial for progress in the START negotiations, it had placed Japan in a difficult position. This was because it had the danger of bringing about a nuclear arms race in the sea area around Japan and the unbridled deployment of nuclear weapons in the Asia and Pacific region.

How do we deal with such a threat? The USSR takes the position that the Navy should also be covered by disarmament negotiations. In particular, the Pacific nations have keen interest in this problem. Soviet Chairman Gorbachev, in his speech in Krasnoyarsk last year, proposed that the major naval powers in the Pacific freeze their respective fleets. There had been other proposals, such as that made by Chairman Gorbachev in Vladivostok in 1986. Furthermore, proposals to start dealing with the naval question have been contained in various statements issued by the Warsaw Pact and the UN speech made by Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. In recent years, the Soviet Union has reduced the number of ships in its Pacific Fleet by 47. By 1991, it will further reduce the number of ships by 16. Moreover, the activities of the Soviet Pacific Fleet are mainly limited to the sea area near its base.

However, due to U.S. resistance, there has not been any negotiation on the navies of the Eastern and Western camps. Soviet Marshal Akhromeyev wrote in PRAVDA last month that the reason the United States took such a position was because it was exceedingly superior in terms of naval manpower and weaponry. He cited the following figures: Compared to the USSR, the United States is 2.5 times superior in large surface vessels, 2 times superior in total tonnage, 2.5 times superior in ship-based aircraft, and 19 times superior in marines. Probably, the Bush administration does not want to give up such superiority and thus it does not want to engage in any negotiation at present. Marshal Akhromeyev wrote that recently, the United States had declared to the Soviet representative that it would be hard to entertain the question of naval activities. Strangely enough, Japan, particularly the conservative sector, shows a measure of understanding of such a U.S. position on the Navy.

SANKEI SHIMBUN on 31 October wrote that the Soviet Union is attempting to transform its military and political situation in a favorable direction by strengthening its own navy and restricting U.S. naval activities. What was the basis of such an assertion? Currently, the United States is in a position of absolute superiority. Moreover, in response to this, the USSR places emphasis on searching for a mutually acceptable proposition. It would be naive to expect that one could deceive the other party and achieve unilateral superiority. The only practicable thing is balanced reduction. The Soviet Union believes that negotiations concerning the Navy should be held sooner or later. As Chairman Gorbachev stressed in Helsinki on 26 October, without resolving this issue, it would be impossible to reduce and overcome military confrontation.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Australian-U.S. Ministerial Talks Assessed

PM0811115189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
8 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[V. Mikheyev dispatch: "Australia: Canberra Sets the Tone of Talks"]

[Text] Sydney—Watson Naval Base, a picturesque place at the entrance to Port Jackson, along whose shores Sydney has spread, was the venue for most significant U.S.-Australian talks, at least in terms of the political weight of their participants and their place in the state hierarchy. This is the first time in the almost 20 years since the visit to Australia by then U.S. President Lyndon Johnson that such an impressive team of Washington politicians has landed at once in this part of the world: U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, Defense Secretary R. Cheney, and Commerce Secretary R. Mosbacher.

The agenda for the talks—formally the fifth at ministerial level—included a broad list of topics: questions of war and peace, including chemical disarmament, relations within the Washington-Canberra-Wellington triangle, regional cooperation in light of Australian Prime Minister R. Hawke's initiative on creating a trade and economic forum of Asian and Pacific states, the fate of Antarctica, and the agreement of positions with regard to the dynamic processes within the USSR and the socialist community countries. A bilateral agreement enshrining the existing accords on cooperation in the defense sphere with the accent on material and technical supplies was signed.

Before explaining the unexpected superficially respectful attention with which Washington has begun to regard its traditionally loyal ally, let us give you a picture of the course of the talks, which in itself gives us an idea of the new distribution of forces. To use sporting terminology, Canberra retained the initiative almost undividedly. It takes the credit for pressuring the U.S. partners on the question of New Zealand's suspended membership of the triple alliance of the Australia-New Zealand-U.S. Defense Pact. Canberra believes that Wellington's excommunication from any contacts with politicians and military figures in the Washington corridors of power—which extends even to the head of government—does not contribute to the spirit of cooperation and dialogue among countries which belong to the single geopolitical alliance code-named "the West."

Thus, Australian diplomacy took on a mission as an intermediary and peacemaker, deriving inspiration and arguments from the openly declared intention of G. Palmer's government to improve relations with the United States, as well as from New Zealand's decision, after long hesitation, to purchase two combat frigates from its neighbors. Nevertheless, according to J. Baker, it is "inappropriate" at present to review military and political ties with Wellington, which is not abandoning its ban on foreign—primarily U.S.—ships with nuclear weapons on board calling at national ports. At the same time Canberra can count as a winning point the more liberal U.S. approach to the question of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific—which in practice could result in the success of the upcoming vote in the UN General Assembly. The U.S. delegate might join those who abstain, but he will no longer vote "against." Let us remind you that the Soviet Union and China supported the Rarotonga Treaty and the idea of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific, which means a ban on stationing nuclear weapons in the region, including on board warships.

An agreed bilateral approach to Moscow's increased interest in the Asia and Pacific region came out of the talks on the topics of perestroyka in the USSR. Contrary to the former bellicose U.S. guardedness, the shifting of emphases in Soviet foreign policy toward the Asia and Pacific region is now regarded as "less threatening." Nevertheless, the Americans reminded their allies of the need to "maintain vigilance." This did not prevent Senator G. Evans, the Australian foreign minister, from previewing the upcoming summit meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush by calling this a significant step on a path which "opens up prospects that were inconceivable only a few years ago." Senator G. Evans also proposed to his U.S. colleague that the possibility be examined of granting the Soviet Union observer status within GATT so as to support the economic reforms of the policy of perestroyka. According to Australian officials, the U.S. delegation reduced its reply to the formula "the time for this has not yet come."

Near East & South Asia

Supreme Soviet Congratulates Lebanon's Mu'awwad

PM0811110589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
8 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium greetings message: "To His Excellency Mr Rene Mu'awwad, Lebanese President"]

[Text] Please accept our sincere congratulations on your election as Lebanese president. We wish you successes in your activity in this crucial period in Lebanon's history.

The Soviet Union will continue to vigorously promote a political settlement and national reconciliation in Lebanon, and to ensure the Lebanese state's unity, sovereignty, and territorial integrity.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

IZVESTIYA on Political Developments in Lebanon

PM0911094989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
6 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[B. Ivanov article: "Disappointment Instead of Hope"]

[Text] On the morning of 4 November General Michel 'Awn, head of the transitional military government of Lebanon, signed a decree dissolving the country's parliament. This happened a few hours before the start of a session of parliament, which was to ratify the "Charter of National Concord" adopted by Lebanese parliamentarians at the conference in Al-Ta'if, as well as ending the anarchy in the country by electing the president of Lebanon.

Such a step strikes a serious blow at the hopes which had appeared in recent days of the possibility of a peaceful settlement of the bloody conflict in Lebanon, which is now into its 15th year, and the country's political reorganization. The charter, which was approved some time ago by parliamentary deputies, provides for Lebanese Muslims to be granted greater suffrage in the political system, where hitherto the Christians have traditionally played the dominant role. In addition, a limited withdrawal of the Syrian military contingent from the country is also proposed. However, the final decision on this score is to be made only 2 years after the start of the implementation of the planned political and constitutional reforms.

The Al-Ta'if agreement was given a far from unequivocal welcome in Lebanon. Gen 'Awn, who is seeking the immediate withdrawal of the Syrian troops from Lebanese territory, virtually rejected it outright, declaring that the adoption of the "Charter of National Concord" would be a "road to hell." Salim al-Huss, who heads the government functioning in the Muslim zone, believes, on the contrary, that the rejection of this document "will take the country toward a catastrophe with unpredictable consequences." To this it is possible to add that there is no unity either in the views of numerous (Muslim and Christian) groupings on the decisions adopted in Al-Ta"if—which in turn complicates still further the political situation in the country.

Serious objections relating to a number of points in the charter have been voiced by the leaders of the pro-Iranian "Hizbullah" organization, by W. Junblatt, chairman of the Progressive Socialist Party, and by N. Birri, head of the Shiite "Amal" movement. In their opinion, the proposed document consolidates the Maronite Christians' and Sunni Muslims' control over the most important state posts—those of president and prime minister of the country.

Against such a political background the holding of the scheduled session of parliament in the Lebanese capital appeared very problematical right from the start. The actions of Gen 'Awn—ranging from organizing mass demonstrations and rallies against the decisions of the Al-Ta'if conference to dissolving parliament—attest that in the very near future it is hardly possible to expect any positive changes in the position of the head of the transitional military government. The point is that, in the view of many observers, agreeing to the points of the charter would mean his losing all his posts and being debarred from all state activity. Following the presidential election and the formation of a new government of national unity, he would hardly find a place either in the country's political institutions or in the army. And a similar fate awaits many other Lebanese politicians and statesmen. Hence the so fierce opposition to adopting the "Charter of National Concord."

As soon as 'Awn's decision to dissolve parliament became known, a number of the country's politicians said that such a step was unlawful. S. al-Huss, in particular, called 'Awn's actions "illegal and unconstitutional," emphasizing that they are not valid. Husayn al-Husayni, former speaker of parliament, discussed the current situation with a group of parliamentarians in Beirut and then flew to Paris for a meeting with 25 parliamentary deputies who are there and who have not yet been able to return to Lebanon because of threats of physical violence against them from "Awn's supporters.

How will things develop in Lebanon now? The country's political circles do not rule out the possibility of imposing a state of emergency—which will lead to all state establishments stopping work. On the other hand, an opinion is being voiced on the possibility of still holding a session of parliament in some safe place. Nevertheless, there is still little ground for optimism. Peace-loving statements have frequently been heard in Lebanon in recent years, and plans have been drawn up to end the civil war. Every time, however, the hopes for a way out of the impasse have given way to disappointment. Will this really happen this time, too?

Envoy Tarasov Discusses Mideast Peace Search

PM0911085589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
9 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with Gennadiy Tarasov, special representative on Near East affairs, by IZVESTIYA own correspondent D. Velikiy: "From Mirages to Realities. Conversation with USSR Special Representative on Near East Affairs"; date of interview not specified; first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] Cairo—The situation in the Near East is still highly complex. Its normalization is still a political mirage, despite efforts by various countries and sides to secure peace in the region.

Under these conditions concrete steps being taken by various states are right at the center of press attention. This was the case with the proposals on questions of a Near East settlement made by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze this February in Cairo. Of late the official trip to Tunis and Egypt by Gennadiy Tarasov, special representative on Near East affairs, has attracted attention. Your correspondent met with the Soviet diplomat and asked him to answer a number of questions.

[Velikiy] What is the purpose of your trip to the Near East and what are its results?

[Tarasov] The Soviet Union maintains contacts with all interested countries and implements an active line in favor of the peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Our contacts with all parties, including in the course of my trip, are subordinate to one task, that of discussing the current situation in the region with our Arab friends and considering the possibilities for making progress toward peace. We attach great significance to maintaining contacts with the PLO, which is indubitably implementing a realistic policy. We also give credit to Egypt's role as a key Arab state. By and large the activation of the Arab factor, the Arabs' involvement in a settlement, and their constructive stance could have a positive impact on the situation in the region.

[Velikiy] A paradoxical situation has now taken shape in the Near East whereby, despite a profusion of settlement plans, there is no real progress as yet. What can this mean: Are the plans bad or is something else impeding their implementation?

[Tarasov] You are indeed correct, there is no shortage of plans in the Near East for resolving the painful issues. Many ideas and proposals have been put forward recently by various parties and they are being vigorously discussed. It must be noted that such activity in the Near East increased appreciably after E.A. Shevardnadze submitted his settlement program based on preparations for an international conference. In the wake of this other ideas and proposals appeared from Israel, Egypt, the United States, and the West European community. In my view, such activeness can in itself be welcomed. Before implementing these proposals, it must be taken into account how far they accord with the fundamental principle of a just solution: balance of interests. However, all the efforts have not as yet brought about practical changes, above all owing to Israel's stance.

[Velikiy] That is, there is a direct linkage between the change in Israel's stance and the possibility of any settlement?

[Tarasov] Yes, for the first time in a long while favorable preconditions have appeared for beginning a movement toward peace in the region. In our view, the constructive PLO stance was one of the main factors here. Israel has to do its part and show readiness to achieve compromises in order to begin the practical movement toward a settlement.

[Velikiy] What role, in your view, could Soviet-U.S. cooperation play in the quest for peace in the Near East?

[Tarasov] We maintain contacts at all levels with the U.S. Administration, and Near East questions were also vigorously discussed during E.A. Shevardnadze's recent meeting with J. Baker. We proceed from the premise that the role of the USSR and the United States as the largest powers and permanent members of the UN Security Council and their collaboration and cooperation in the attainment of peace in the Near East are without doubt a positive and important factor. That does not mean that other states should not make their contribution to settling the Near East conflict. In this connection we assess highly the efforts and stance adopted by the members of the European Community and are also holding active consultations within them with a view to creating a favorable international atmosphere for a Near East settlement. This policy will continue.

[Velikiy] Many observers' assessments voice the notion that the Soviet Union could take a more active part in the talks, in the actual Near East settlement process, if diplomatic relations with Israel were resumed. What comment would you make on this?

[Tarasov] Israel is one of the main parties in the conflict: We hear it out and maintain contacts with it. We are in favor of dialogue with Israel and conduct this dialogue at various levels and will continue to exchange opinions and set out our standpoint on various aspects of the situation in the Near East and on questions of a settlement. As for diplomatic relations, our stance here is well known: Real improvements on questions of a settlement would create favorable preconditions for positive movement here.

Faults of Baker, Shamir Plans for Palestine Seen

LD0811160889 Moscow TASS in English 1535 GMT 8 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 8 TASS—By TASS political news analyst Albert Balebanov:

The Palestinian uprising in the West Bank of Jordan and Gaza Strip is in its 24th month. It is aimed at putting an end to Israel's occupation of native Arab lands and at ensuring Palestinians' freedom and independence and creation of their sovereign state.

The fact that despite terror of the Israeli military administration the uprising continues bespeaks of the Palestinian people's resolve to achieve the goals set.

The world community has long since recognized the Palestinians' equal right with Israelis to self-determination, and peaceful and secure life in their native land. But they are denied this by Israel.

This situation is the main cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict that has continued for many years. And though of late there have been many proposals aimed at the settlement of the conflict, there has been no progress toward this.

There are two explanations for this state of things. First, far from all proposals preceed from balancing the interests of the warring sides. The Shamir plan and the Baker plan have these shortcomings.

Second, all international efforts to reconcile the sides are brought to nought by Israel.

The plans of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir and of U.S. Secretary of State James Baker actually do not go further than elections in Israel-occupied territories.

They are attractive only for one side—Israel. meanwhile, the other side, the Palestinian people, is not guaranteed the main thing—freedom and statehood.

Neither the USA nor Israel views the proposed Israeli-Palestinian dialogue as a step toward convening an international Middle East conference under the United Nations auspices with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the PLO, the sole lawful representative of the Palestinian people.

Neither Washington nor Tel Aviv is prepared to make the elections they propose to be held in the West Bank of Jordan and Gaza Strip an initial stage on the road to universal settlement in the region envisaging durable and fair peace and security for all the sides.

Then how can one count on the success of the quests for the solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict?

If one makes claims to realism in the Middle East policy, one should not strive to keep the PLO from the negotiating process. And this is precisely where the U.S. and Israeli initiatives lead.

The refusal to recognize the PLO, which is Tel Aviv's condition for recognising Baker plan, dooms to failure any versions for the solution of the Palestinian problem which is central to the Middle East conflict.

To disregard the PLO means to undermine the efforts of the international community seeking settlement in the region.

This is why the Shamir plan and the Baker plan can hardly be regarded as sincere. None of these plans will bring peace to the long-suffering land of the Middle East.

Success can be ensured only by a painstaking quest for balanced and mutually acceptable compromises, not by ultimatums.

Saudi-Officered Rebel Units Targeting Kabul

PM0811153389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS correspondent Yu. Tyssovskiy special dispatch for IZVESTIYA: "Afghanistan: Foreign Advisers in the Opposition's Detachments"]

[Text] One ravine is like another, there are thousands of them in Afghanistan. A gurgling stream—the Lalandar, which gave this ravine its name—tightly embraced by bare, lifeless rocks. Dekak, a deserted village with silent mud walls. A quick click of the camera records a serene picture of an Afghan fall.

But you only have to turn slightly to one side and... laid out on withered grass there are rows of silvery "surface to surface" missiles. "SAKR-30" missiles, lethal weapons made in Egypt which are used by the armed opposition to shell Kabul. Next to them lie rockets covered with Chinese characters, various caliber mortar munitions of U.S. origin, Italian antitank and antipersonnel mines, poods of explosives, and kilometers of Bickford fuse.

This sizable arsenal, hidden in the Lalandar caves, was located only 20 km from the Afghan capital. The crests of the high mountains surrounding the ravine are crisscrossed by trenches and deep dug-outs housing command posts. The Lalandar fortified area was flushed out by subunits of the Republic of Afghanistan Armed Forces 4th Infantry Division in a 3-day battle in the southern sector of the approaches to Kabul.

The operation was planned swiftly, Colonel Baryalay, 4th Division chief of staff, relates. More then 1,500 rebels were concentrated in Lalandar, belonging mostly to the "regiments" of the "Al-Fajjar," "Abu-Bakr," and "Al-Ghaziya" fighters. As you can see, all the names are Arabic, each rebel detachment was headed by Saudi advisers—Wahhabis. We were lucky in that a large number of the rebels, following the orders of their commanders, had been switched to Lowgar where government forces were convoying a large motor vehicle column.

We were told that 20,000 Pakistani rupees were being paid for every captured Afghan soldier or officer and that the fanatics had to supply the chopped off head as proof. Afghan refugees in camps on Pakistani territory, suffering from cold and living in dreadful conditions, are being enticed by large handouts. A young man agreeing to take part in the "Jihad" receives 20,000 rupees as a one-off payment and 1,500 rupees monthly as "blood money." Commanders get more—5,000 rupees. For 10 days' participation in combat operations on the territory of the Republic of Afghanistan each of them receives a "travel allowance" totaling 100,000 rupees. The allowance for the wounded totals 50,000 rupees...

Kabul frequently comes under fire from the southern approaches to the capital. The rockets from Lalandar were targeted on the residential compound of the USSR embassy. During the past 8 months or so since the withdrawal of the Soviet forces six rockets have fallen on embassy territory. Fortunately there have been no casualties. A week ago Hikmatyar's henchmen subjected the capital to intensive shelling, including from Lalandar, timed to coincide with the beginning of the academic year at Kabul schools.

The "SAKR" missiles claim human lives almost every day, exploding in residential areas of the city. The 4th Division operation has deprived the Lalandar extremists of their sting for a while. However there are countless such valleys around Kabul and therefore much work lies ahead of the Republic of Afghanistan Armed Forces.

CPSU Representatives Depart Morocco 28 Oct

LD2810171989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0910 GMT 28 Oct 89

[Text] Rabat, 28 Oct (TASS)—A.Yu. Urnov, deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee international department, and V.G. Nakhodkin, a high-ranking official of that department, representatives of the CPSU, today left Morocco.

At the invitation of the leadership of the African Socialist and Democratic International, they took part in the session of the General Council of that organization and of the "Africa-Europe 1992" international conference.

East Europe

Further Reportage on GDR Leadership Changes

SED Politburo Resignations

LD0811185389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 8 Nov 89

[Text] An extended plenum of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee opened today in the capital of the German Democratic Republic. Anatoliy Stepkin, our correspondent in Berlin, talks about it.

[Stepkin] This event has extraordinary significance for the Republic. The mass media has only just reported that at the proposal of the general secretary of the SED Central Committee Politburo, the whole of the Politburo is resigning. This step, Egon Krenz declared, should clearly show who bears responsibility for the situation which has taken shape. The plenum, it is reported, unanimously accepted the Politburo's resignation proposal.

At the SED Central Committee plenum, which will last for 3 days, from 8 to 10 November, important issues of the Republic will be discussed, as well as cadre composition and cadre issues. The election of a new Politburo and general secretary has been held and the party's program of action for the immediate future has also been adopted.

During the previous evening, 7 November, the resignation of the GDR Government was announced in Berlin. As Wolfgang Meyer, the Council of Ministers' official representative, told journalists, an appropriate declaration had been submitted to the Presidium of the GDR People's Chamber. The old membership will carry out their duties until the convocation of the People's Chamber and the appointment of a new Council of Ministers.

[Announcer] The changes that are occurring in the GDR are in no way a mainifestation of the Party's perplexity. On the contrary, the SED is declaring its readiness to make decisions energetically and quickly, in tune with the spirit of the times. The party is talking about the need to adopt a clear, new program of action and to take decisive steps in renewing policies, the economy, and the life of all of society.

GDR Government Resignation

PM0911095189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
9 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy dispatch under the "Abroad" rubric: "Events in the GDR"]

[Text] Berlin—W. Meyer, government press spokesman, called an emergency press conference at which he announced that the entire GDR Council of Ministers has resigned.

A corresponding statement was issued to the GDR People's Chamber Presidium. In accordance with Article 50 of the GDR Constitution the government will exercise its power until the People's Chamber forms and ratifies a new cabinet of ministers. The government urged all the country's citizens in the current serious political and economic situation to apply all their efforts to maintaining vital services for the people, society, and the economy. These include economic tasks which must be fulfilled in full and without interruption, work in industry and construction, on transport, in agriculture, trade, public health, and social security, in all echelons of public life. The interests of the entire people require that public order be preserved.

The government also appealed to those citizens who intend to leave the republic to ponder their decision well once again. Our socialist motherland, the appeal said, needs each and every one of you.

At its Tuesday session the People's Chamber Constitution and Law Commission demanded the urgent convocation of a parliamentary session to discuss the situation that has taken shape in the country. Deputies voiced dissatisfaction with the stance of the People's Chamber Presidium, which has hitherto failed to announce a session despite the fact that more than one-third of deputies demanded one.

It is expected to meet next week.

Mass demonstrations and rallies are continuing in the country.

Krenz Addresses SED Central Committee 8 Nov

TASS Reports Krenz Speech

LD0911082589 Moscow TASS in English 0704 GMT
9 Nov 89

[Text] Berlin November 9 TASS—The situation in the German Democratic Republic (GDR) is strained and highly contradictory, Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SUPG) [SED] leader Egon Krenz said at a plenary meeting of the party's Central Committee which began on Wednesday [8 November].

"A widespread popular movement has developed and has given rise to a process of reassessments and changes. Both illusory notions and anti-socialist concepts have become widespread.

"This worries many citizens. The matter concerns neither more nor less than the future of the country as a socialist state in the centre of Europe," he emphasised.

Analysing the causes of the current situation, Krenz pointed out that the party tried to exercise its guiding role in society through administrative methods.

"It is clear that the platform of the SUPG's 11th congress was based on unrealistic estimates. Subjective notions about desired goals served as points of departure in planning economic tasks, and the universality of the normal processes of contemporary socialism was not taken into account.

"Disrespect for the individual and for the person's competence in professional and social activities quite often resulted in amateurishness in assessments of the spiritual potential of the people and doomed creative endeavour to decline.

"All this most seriously influenced people's sentiments in the country. Discontent was mounting. Demonstrations began to take place, with an overwhelming majority of participants favouring changes in socialist society.

"These and other social causes have been the main contributory factors in the decision taken by more than 200,000 citizens of the country to leave their native land or express a desire to do this.

"The bulk of them are not opponents of socialism or criminals. These are people who did not see possibilities in our country for the full development of their personality any longer or for the realisation of their requirements and interests," Krenz said.

Following the 9th plenary meeting of the SUPG Central Committee, a truly nationwide dialogue on all problems began in the GDR. The Politburo believes that all new civic initiatives that are based on the Constitution of the GDR should be allowed to be practised unimpededly."

Krenz emphasised that the indisputable authority of individual communists aggravated the situation. Collectivism was ensured in the Politburo to an ever lesser extent.

"This led to subjective decisions. The criticism of negative phenomena was to an increasing extent shoved off onto western propaganda.

"A negative wait-and-see attitude and partly dogmatic and haughty attitude to processes taking place in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries added to that.

"Ideas were mooted in the Politburo for a long time about the need to change economic policy and introduce adjustments to the forms and methods of party guidance.

"However, they did not get support from a majority of party leaders because misunderstandings of the situation predominated. This period has been one of the most dramatic and most complex periods in the history of our party," the SUPG leader said.

Krenz touched upon a programme for transformations which is being offered for a nationwide discussion. In the economic field the programme envisages urgent measures to stabilise the situation and work out a new strategy based on sound calculations, and to combine socialist planning with the stimulating impact of the market.

"This requries new status for integrated complexes and enterprises in the economy. Close cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is, like before, a decisive guarantee of a consistent accomplishment of economic tasks.

"Serious reforms are expected to be effected in all other spheres of life. This also applies to the political system which is now little orientated towards democracy.

"Reforms will be carried out by the SUPG in close cooperation with all the parties that make up the democratic bloc and with the full endorsement of the people," Krenz stressed.

ADN Cited on Krenz Address

LD0811203789 Moscow TASS in English 1946 GMT 8 Nov 89

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—Conditions must now be created in the GDR for a renewal of socialism which render a return to the old times impossible.

Delivering a speech to a Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee session here on Wednesday [8 November]. Krenz said: "The turn we want is still a long way off and we have to reckon with opposition to it."

There was a need now for conditions and structures to be established that ruled out recurrence of crises for good and that gave a new quality to socialism in the country.

A popular movement had triggered the process of checking and changing. It demanded a socialist society in which everybody could lead his own life in his responsibility and contribute to a community. "Criticism focused on our party, particularly on its leadership. Results from the responsibility we assumed for society." Krenz said he acknowledged this responsibility and so did the Politburo.

The political approach to the 11th SED Congres in 1986 was based on an unrealistic assessment of the situation, Krenz went on. The definition of economic tasks was based on wishful thinking, and inherent processes of development of modern socialism were not comprehended as universally valid. Instead of pointing out problems immediately and directly to win all people for active participation in the country's affairs, attempts were made to suggest to them a GDR picture which was increasingly distant from their every-day experience, Krenz said. The manifold forms of democracy lagged behind people's demands for participation, he said.

With reference to the tens of thousands of people leaving the GDR, Krenz said: "Without underestimating the influence of the opponent, his intentions and campaigns against socialism in the GDR, we have to admit that the real reasons for this painful exodus lie in this country."

"The Politburo of the SED Central Committee holds that new citizens' action groups which are willing to work on the basis of the Constitution should be legalized", he said.

The initiated social awakening "is making demands on us which require everyone in every place to make all-out efforts," Krenz said. "We must make a self-critical assessment:" We were not prepared for the open outbreak of conflicts, for the new questions emerging in our society."

The successes achieved in the GDR since 1971 had led to an unchallengeable dominance of individual party officials. The Politburo's collective functioning was guaranteed less and less. Criticism and self-criticism remained underdeveloped. All of this ever more often led to subjectivists decisions.

"Adding to this were wait-and-see attitudes, disapproving, partly dogmatic, partly arrogant tendencies towards the development in the Soviet Union which were not conducive to our close combat alliance with the Soviet Communist Party."

Krenz said the Politburo had fallen seriously behind in analytical and conceptional work. At a time when wise, determined and concerted action was urgently needed the party leadership had remained speechless. This impaired the party's capacity to act and enhanced destabilization in the country. "This time is without doubt one of the most dramatic and complicated in the history of the party. Discussion on how such a serious undesirable development could take place must lead to guarantees in the long run which rule out a repetition for ever.

SED Ready for 'Fundamental Reforms'

LD0811225389 Moscow TASS in English 2115 GMT 8 Nov 89

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—"We can and want to effect the revolutionary changes our party's social strategy aims at in partnership with all forces ready for it through fundamental reforms," GDR party and state leader Egon Krenz has said.

Krenz was speaking about a future concept for fundamentally renewing socialism in the GDR as he was addressing a Central Committee meeting of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) here on Tuesday [day as received].

These changes, he said, were to lend socialism a new quality.

"We need a realistic vision of the future, a socialism which is economically effective, socially just, politically democratic, morally clean and devoted to the people," Krenz said. This could be derived only from the sovereign decision of a majority of the people, which required a big social consensus. A renewal could be based only on the experience and the needs of the people.

The overriding point was the definition of a socialism where man was his own master and where his work was the key to a better satisfaction of his needs and interests, Krenz said.

"Our social strategy is judged according to the possibilities it offers to each individual for his personal development, according to the room it provides for an individual fashioning of life."

Future social freedom must be understood chiefly as a democratic search for variants and a definition of the most favourable possibilities for further progress. This required militant striving for decisions, freedom of opinion, responsibility and effective mechanisms of control. More importance should be attached to conscience and morale in politics, the economy and other fields.

Krenz came out for a critical and productive exchange of experience among the socialist countries to enable the drafting of a modern concept of socialism. "Tied up in the history and presence we are facing a common responsibility," Krenz said.

Radical Economic Reform 'Indispensible'

LD0811225989 Moscow TASS in English 2140 GMT 8 Nov 89

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—A general change of economic policy linked with a radical reform of the economy are indispensable in the GDR, GDR SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] Party and State leader Egon Krenz has said.

Krenz was addressing a Central Committee meeting of the Socialist Unity party of Germany (SED), which opened here on Wednesday [8 November].

It was especially the economic contradictions which had rapidly worsened in the 80s, he said. They lay in hesitant reaction in economic policy and also "in our inability to search for solutions in a consensus with the party rank and file and the people."

There was no doubt about a renewal of society being impossible without dynamic economic growth. Basic ideas of how to achieve this were contained in a draft programme of action of the SED.

"The point is to harmoniously combine the advantages of socialist planning and the stimulating effects of the market," Krenz said. A flexible system must be created which was capable of constant renewal.

The principle saying what is consumed must have been produced beforehand had been violated for a long period of time, Krenz stated critically. Plan targets failed to be met while consumption, housing construction and many fields of social policies grew faster than planned.

The situation was also reflected by the state budget which was always said to have been well-balanced. It was, however, neglected that this balance was established partly only due to credits.

As to the 1990 economic plan, a socio-economic stabilizing programme should be drafted, which had to include a programme for the development of consumer goods production, particularly providing for a boost to production of goods very much in demand.

The subsidies policy needed to be analysed to introduce differentiated measures to change this policy with social security guaranteed.

Krenz Answers Questions at Moscow News Conference

90UI0106A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 44, 4-10 Nov 89 pp 2-3

[Report by M. Dmitriyev on press conference given by Egon Krenz, SED General Secretary and Chairman of the GDR Council of State, at the press center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Moscow: "E. Krenz: To Gain the Trust of the People"; date not specified]

[Text] Great changes have occurred in the German Democratic Republic in recent weeks. Egon Krenz has been elected to the posts of General Secretary of the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] and Chairman of the Council of State of that country. E. Krenz paid his first visit abroad in his capacity of the head of the governing party and state to the Soviet Union. His press conference devoted to the results of the visit was held at the press center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In the course of the conference, Egon Krenz made a statement and responded to questions from journalists.

In his opening statement, E. Krenz said: "During my meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, the discussion was about reinforcing socialism in our countries. He described the processes currently under way in the GDR and the USSR as the continuation and development of the ideas of October. Studying the experience of perestroyka accumulated in the USSR will help us in our work.

"I informed Comrade Gorbachev about the results of the 9th SED Central Committee Plenum. This plenum begins the turn in our country, the goal of which is to continue reinforcing socialism on German soil. We agreed that the party should continue leading this process, involving in it as many people as possible."

[Correspondent] Which of the issues the GDR is now facing do you consider to be the most urgent?

[Krenz] We should prepare very thoroughly for the plenum of our party which will be held next week. At the plenum, we intend to propose to the Central Committee a new action program addressed to the entire people. The main point at present is to gain the trust of the people.

[Correspondent] To your mind, is a reverse outflow of Germans from the FRG to your country possible?

[Krenz] I am firmly convinced that socialism is the best system. If I did not have such a conviction I could not head my party and the state. If we succeed in improving socialism in the manner in which we are planning to, it will be attractive not only to our citizens but for the citizens of other countries as well.

[Correspondent] You were very closely associated with E. Honecker. Do you believe that during his reign any mistakes were made, and if so, what mistakes?

[Krenz] Indeed, I was closely associated with Comrade Honecker, and I do not think that this is bad. After all, there are instances in politics when you walk together with somebody, and there are occasions, instances when you have to assume responsibility alone. Under the leadership of E. Honecker, many good things were done which are of lasting value; this is why I am not ashamed of this time.

In politics, honesty is very important, and we, the communists, are honest people. The fact that I represent the policy of renewal is exactly the reason why the SED Central Committee elected me to the post of general secretary. However, we do not have to criticize E. Honecker or hold him responsible for the past to this end.

[Correspondent] Are there "blank spots" in the history of relations between the GDR and the USSR?

[Krenz] Our party is now publishing a 4-volume history of the SED; it includes many new, previously unknown facts. Our scientists continue to work on the history of the German people. The main principle from which our party proceeds is as follows: History should remain history. It is already in the past.

At the same time, I think that the discussion on the issues of history should continue. Different generations assess the lessons of history differently. We cannot proceed from one generation resolving the issues of history once and for all, and this resolution automatically passing to the next generation. Every generation should study its history in a new manner.

[Correspondent] What is your attitude toward the events in Poland and Hungary? Do you believe that what is happening there at present may serve as a model for the future development of the GDR?

[Krenz] I do not like models because the desire to copy them always appears. It is very important that the socialist countries and their communist parties have agreed that every country is responsible for the processes which occur at home. Perhaps you remember that M.S. Gorbachev, speaking in Berlin on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the GDR, said that any decision concerning the GDR should be made in Berlin rather than Moscow.

If we were to proceed from models, this would possibly bring about a restricting of national sovereignty and the responsibility for the development of one's own country.

[Correspondent] Have restrictions been removed on disseminating the Soviet publications which were previously banned in the GDR?

[Krenz] I am not aware of a Soviet publication which is currently banned in the GDR. The dissemination of the SPUTNIK magazine and other magazines and newspapers has been authorized again.

[Correspondent] Do changes in store for the GDR include an opportunity for the emergence of new parties?

[Krenz] As you know, socialist pluralism exists in the GDR. Along with the SED, there are the Christian Democratic Union, the Democratic Peasants' Party, the Liberal Democratic Party of Germany, and the National Democratic Party. I maintain friendly contacts and a good working relationship with the chairmen of these parties. These parties make a distinctive contribution to our coalition, and our party intends to continue participating in it. The vanguard role of the SED is codified in the GDR Constitution. I have sworn to be faithful to the Constitution, and I will do everything in my power in order for this article of the Constitution to be carried out.

[Correspondent] You mentioned sharing experience with M.S. Gorbachev. The letter of Nina Andreyeva, i.e., an attempt at turning back, also belongs to the experience of perestroyka. Are there guarantees for you personally and the country that the same will not happen in the GDR?

[Krenz] It is a part of our plans to develop an extensive discussion all over the country, and everyone will be free to voice his opinion. As far as I am concerned, personally I will always proceed from my worldview. I am convinced that it reflects the reality of the world correctly. Others will proceed from other positions.

We are going to work, discuss the problems facing us, and we are going to take any person with us. The main point is for him to subscribe to the position of our constitution.

[Correspondent] Until recently, you were considered to be a proponent of the hard line in the West, and now you are talking as Mikhail Gorbachev. It is hard to understand whether you are a proponent of the hard line or whether you have changed?

[Krenz] I do not care for putting labels on people. The labels may be erroneous. I have always considered myself to be a member of my party which knows no higher ideal than to work in order for the people to live better and to make its contribution to the cause of maintaining peace.

It is bad to call me a proponent of the hard line without knowing my specific work. I am a Communist, and I first of all fight for the cause of our country to be advanced. He who cannot change will stand in place, and who would want that?

[Correspondent] Many people in the West believe that the visit to Berlin by M.S. Gorbachev and the subsequent changes in the GDR leadership were not a mere coincidence. Is it so?

[Krenz] I must resolutely reject such allegations. Mikhail Sergeyevich would have never acted that way. This would have run counter to the foundations of his policy. Everything that has happened in the GDR is the result of work of the Politburo of the Central Committee of my party.

The visit by M.S. Gorbachev to Berlin was very good, though. This, however, is an entirely different issue.

ADN Reports Schabowski News Conference in Berlin

LD0911104189 Moscow TASS in English 0950 GMT 9 Nov 89

[Text] Berlin 9/11/ TASS—The GDR news agency ADN reports:

Berlin (ADN)—Guenter Schabowski had a hard day when he faced journalists in the international press centre here on Wednesday night.

In the morning, he resigned together with the other members and candidate members of the Politburo of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED). In the early afternoon, the SED Central Committee re-elected him to the body, and shortly afterwards he stepped out of the Central Committee Building where thousands of demonstrators, most of them rank-and-file members of the Party, had gathered.

In his view a party conference, loudly demanded by the demonstrators, would play a great role in the foreseeable future of the SED. The same as the Politburo had faced the Central Committee on Wednesday this body, too, should regain authority and credibility.

Schabowski, who is in charge of the media with the SED Politburo, was remarkably frank in his information about personnel changes. For the first time the nation was briefed about who held which post in the Central Committee Secretariat. The press conference was broadcast live by radio and television.

The decisive questions of the evening were without doubt those related to the SED's claim to leadership in the GDR's political system and to free elections. Schabowski deplored a great deficit in democracy, which, he said, had let to a crisis of confidence on the part of the people. It was now important to define anew the relationship between socialism and democracy.

The question of the SED's leading role basically required also this role be defined anew. Today, the party of the working class was perhaps the political force which took the most consistent interest in preserving the socialist foundations of the GDR. This, however, required a renewal of the party itself.

Schabowski did not rule out coalitions as a result of free elections. The final decision, however, was made by the self-assured political forces in the country.

Schabowski presented himself as a man who sets an example of the challenges of the programme of action under which the SED must be a strong party capable of action and imbued with a new, democratic self-assurance.

To put the goal of the three-day Central Committee meeting in a nutshell: A concept which makes the Party rank-and-file capable of action again and which motivates sceptics to cooperate. This is the task the new crew will have to be measured by.

Moscow TV Reports GDR Political Developments

LD0811220489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee plenum opened in Berlin today. [Video shows mass meeting in Berlin]

[Reporter Vyacheslav Mostovoy] This picture is typical of the GDR at present. This meeting is taking place in front of the SED Central Committee building. The process of reform and renewal that began in the GDR just a few weeks ago is proceeding at an unusual speed. Just yesterday evening there was the news that the country's government had resigned. Then today, a few hours after the SED Central Committee plenum began its work, there was news of yet another most important political event in the country's life. The plenum unanimously proclaimed itself in favor of the resignation of the Central Committee Politburo. This proposal was submitted by Egon Krenz, the general secretary.

It was noted that this step should clearly show the whole of society who bears responsibility for the critical situation that has now come about in the country. Many thousand-strong meetings and demonstrations are continuing throughout the whole republic. They are demanding resolute and concrete actions and reforms in various spheres. The mass information media are objectively and in detail covering the events and emphasizing that the population's main demands are for the holding of democratic elections, the SED giving up its leading role in society, and guarantees that the reforms will be irreversible. [Video shows speakers addressing mass meetings and demonstrators marching with banners.]

The most vivid evidence of the population's dissatisfaction has been the incessant departure of GDR citizens for the FRG. Over the past 24 hours alone more than 10,000 persons, primarily young people, have left the country through Czechoslovakia. A grave situation is being created in this connection in particular spheres of the national economy, especially in medicine and the services spheres. Military doctors and medical students are being urgently dispatched to hospitals and outpatient clinics. The resignation statement of the GDR Government and speeches by representatives of various political and public organizations contain appeals to citizens intending to leave the country to reconsider their decision and remain. The country's leadership is taking measures to change the situation. [Video shows a crowded indoor meeting.]

The results of the first day's work of the SED Central Committee plenum have just been made known. Egon Krenz has been unanimously confirmed in the post of general secretary of the Central Committee. The present Politburo has 11 members, which is 10 fewer than the last one. [Video shows Mostovoy standing next to television screen depicting demonstrations.]

GDR Eases Travel Restrictions; Rallies Continue

PM0811155389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
7 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[V. Lapskiy dispatch under the general heading "IZVESTIYA Correspondents Comment": "The GDR—Days of Trial"]

[Text] I have never seen such waiting lines at newspaper stands as I saw today, 6 November, in Berlin. The newspapers are publishing the draft law on travel for GDR citizens abroad. Today its nationwide discussion will begin. It will continue until the end of November and then the draft, with changes and amendments, will be submitted to the People's Chamber.

The draft law says that GDR citizens have the right to possess a foreign travel passport and be able to travel to any country in the world if they obtain the appropriate entry visa. The only travel restrictions are in connection with the need to preserve state secrets and public order. Refusals to issue a passport must be justified in writing. Those who are refused a passport have the right to lodge a complaint with judicial bodies. The question of exchanging the necessary currency for foreign travel has not yet been resolved.

Army General Friedriech Dickel, GDR minister of the interior, appeared on the "Topical Camera" television program. He said that in accordance with the draft law, there will be a new way of making requests to leave the GDR in order to live permanently abroad. This question will be resolved within 3-6 months.

Meanwhile there are reports about the continuing mass exodus of GDR citizens to the FRG. At the end of last week 13,000 people who had left the GDR for Czechoslovakia obtained the right to leave for West Germany by an agreement between the governments of these countries. They were allocated several trains for this purpose. It has been reported that since 11 September, that is, since the day the borders were opened between Hungary and Austria, over 50,000 GDR citizens have crossed them, westward bound. Altogether around 92,000 people have left this year.

Those who left for the West have the right to return to the GDR with no consequences to fear.

In connection with the mass outflow of people, and young people with special skills in particular, a strain can be felt in certain social spheres. There are not enough doctors, salesmen, or craftsmen serving the population. A decision has been made to send 2,000 army doctors and orderlies to hospitals and health centers from 1 December.

Political party and state leaders, social organizations, and the church are appealing to citizens who are preparing to leave the country to change their mind and stay in the GDR. The process of radical transformations that has begun, they stress, will enable them to change their lives for the better in the republic shortly.

Demonstrations and rallies are continuing all over the GDR. Following the 4 November demonstration—the biggest in the republic's history—in which half a million people participated without disturbing the peace, street processions and rallies were held in Magdeburg, Jena, Ge[illegible] Suhl, Leipzig, Rostock, Karl-Marx-Stadt and other cities. Those who participated in these demanded, as before, swift radical reforms in all spheres of economic, political, and social life, genuine openness and freedom of opinion, and rights to be granted to so-called initiative groups, including the influential alternative movement "New Forum."

NEUES DEUTSCHLAND answers Western politicians' and journalists' predictions that there will soon be an explosion in the GDR. This explosion, they say, will lead to destabilization in the whole central European area. As the newspaper writes, they are speculating that socialism on German soil will come to an end. But it continues: Our point of view is well known. Socialism in our country is not being questioned, and there can be no talk of the "sale" or "Anschluss" of the GDR. The changes being implemented by our country today do not propose less socialism but improved and more effective socialism that is more attractive to people.

Article Sees Changes in GDR Irreversible

90UI0109A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 5 Nov 89 p 3

[Article by S. Pomerantsev, SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent datelined Berlin, 4 November: "There Is No Going Back"]

[Text] Several months ago, Ambassador Wolfgang Mayer, a representative of the GDR MFA [Ministry of Foreign Affairs] on press questions, was asked at a friendly meeting with Soviet journalists: Why doesn't the ministry conduct briefings as is done in many countries? The ambassador answered in this spirit: Few significant events occur in the GDR, and if regular press conferences were institutionalized, there might not be enough topics for them.

Today, I think he would not begin to assert this. Literally every day is rich with events, including the kind that require skillful commentary to clarify sociopolitical events in the GDR constructively.

Here are just a few events from the chronicle of the last few days. On Friday evening [3 November] people listened with interest and hope to a statement by Egon Krenz over radio and television. He gave the very highest marks to the results of the meeting held the other day with M.S. Gorbachev. He reported in particular about the adoption by the Politburo of the Central Committee of the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] of a draft of basic provisions of a program of action in the name of a renewal in policy, and in the economy and society, which will be tabled for review by the Central Committee plenum that opens on 8 November, and he talked about the decision of five members of the Politburo to step down in favor of younger forces. A sanctioned multi-thousand demonstration and meeting was held today in Berlin in defense of the constitutionally guaranteed rights of freedom of expression and the press, and the right to assemble. And 2 days earlier, the GDR Council of Ministers characterized the political and economic situation in the country as critical. An announcement was made about the resignation from their posts of leader of the trade unions of the country and first secretaries of the SED of the districts of Gera, Suhl, and Schwerin, the mayor of Leipzig, the chairmen of two of the five political parties that are part of the democratic bloc: the National Democratic Party and Christian-Democratic Alliance. The secretary of the central board of another party—the Liberal Democratic Party—recommended that a faction of this party introduce a proposal to the National Chamber on the resignation of the Government.

From other news it is interesting to note the return to viewers of five Soviet films purchased by the GDR but withdrawn last autumn from the film lending service. The newspaper NEUES DEUTSCHLAND called this decision "the rehabilitation of Soviet film reels," and it also reported that one more film will find its way to GDR viewers, "Repentance." This newspaper once carried a naive-didactic review of the Tengiz Abuladze film, which is profound in concept and execution.

Starting on 1 November, the way is open once again for GDR citizens to visit neighboring Czechoslovakia (there, incidentally, the temporary restrictions were also not welcome because a certain part of the population, especially in the border areas, specialized in providing services to numerous tourists from the GDR). And again, unfortunately, a great number of citizens decided to leave the GDR and selected for this, as it seems to them, a "reliable" channel through the FRG Embassy in Prague. Referring to Western sources, it was announced that there were still several thousand persons there yesterday. And this despite the explanations made by GDR official representatives that it is in the interests of the citizens to legalize departure formalities in the homeland and not under the "roof" of the West German Embassy in another country.

How to do this quicker and more effectively are questions that are being discussed everywhere now: at enterprises and in cooperatives, in political parties, and in street rallies, in social organizations, student halls, departments, the mass media, and in religious circles. The Democratic Christian Party and the Christian Mutual Assistance Association promulgated their proposals today.

Many discussions are going on about the need for the reform of the political system, the administration, the economy, and national education, for adherence to the principle of pay according to work done, on shortcomings in supplies for the population, and on the practice of bureaucratic petty protectionism. I want to make note of the high culture and the constructiveness of the complicated political dialogue in the GDR. Even at meetings that are distinguished by great emotionalism, each speaker, as a rule, is listened to, and the most varied statements are carefully recorded. A process of accumulating ideas, proposals, demands, and critical speeches is going on in the country. This is the principle: The opinion of each member of society is valuable. Even our fraternal newspaper NEUE DEUTSCHE BAUERN ZEITUNG has not stood aside from this process. It announced the days on which, at a specified time, a reader could personally come with a proposal, criticism, and questions directly to the editorial managers.

"We are not confident," says Udo Augustin, editor in chief of the Christian newspaper, "that on the first 'reception days' many visitors will come to us, but we hope that in time such conversations will become a good form of dialogue with the reader."

It is also important to note the following detail: Meetings and demonstrations—sanctioned or not—are being conducted during nonwork hours and days. There is a profound understanding in society that any lowering of work activity only aggravates the situation that has developed. And, to the contrary, only responsible and conscientious labor is the most important prerequisite for the desired changes, in particular in the sphere of supplying the population. It is a small but evident fact: Some of the drivers of governmental vehicles, temporarily changing their formal uniforms for overalls, are coming in lines to the aid of their colleagues, transporting commodities to food stores of the capital...

All spheres in the life of the fraternal country today are marked by changes. To some here, they do not seem sufficiently dynamic, but this impatience is met with understanding as well. The mood of the public is very accurately reflected in the words from Egon Krenz's address to his fellow citizens: "There is no going back."

Mitterrand Greets Gorbachev on October Holiday

LD0711131189 Paris Domestic Service in French 1200 GMT 7 Nov 89

[Excerpts] There were two processions in Moscow this morning for the 72d anniversary of the October Revolution. There was the official procession in Red Square in the presence of all the public figures, with Mikhail Gorbachev at their head, of course; but there was also a demonstration which was, let us say antiestablishment, if not by the opposition, for which apparently between 4,000 and 5,000 people gathered in another district of the city. [passage omitted]

Among the messages received in Moscow this morning is that from President Mitterand, who writes to Mikhail Gorbachev: In the period of decisive transformation which Europe is today experiencing, I, together with my compatriots, attach the greatest possible importance to the success of the enormous effort for reform undertaken in your country. [passage omitted]

West Europe

PCI's Rubbi Comments on Meeting with Gorbachev

PM0811123289 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 5 Nov 89 p2

[Interview with Italian Communist Party Foreign Section Chief Antonio Rubbi by Renzo Foa; date, place not given]

[Text] "Oh, good, you're back..." This is how Mikhail Gorbachev welcomed Antonio Rubbi, who was visiting Moscow on the eve of the Soviet leader's visit to Italy and of the two appointments that he has made with the Pope and U.S. President Bush. This was last Tuesday [31 October] in the new parliament in the Kremlin, which everyone has been able to see live on television. Gorbachev had just declared the morning session closed and there, next to the chairman's table, he had an exchange of ideas with the Italian Communist Party's [PCI] Foreign Section chief.

"What do you think?" Gorbachev asked, pointing to the now almost empty chamber of the Soviet. Rubbi—who as a young man studied in Moscow, to which he has subsequently returned many times—replied: "It is certainly not the Soviet that I remembered..." "Yes," the Soviet president said: "It is democracy in action... but what hard work." "Mikhail Sergeyevich," Rubbi added, "Does it not seem to you that you have rather too many tasks: You on your own do that which is done in a parliament such as ours by the entire Secretariat staff; if you carry on this way you will kill yourself with exhaustion." "Yes, it's true, but for the time being it's essential to do things this way." Alternating between formal and familiar forms of address, the conversation began with these remarks, directly and without interpreters. "I heard," Gorbachev said, "about the conversation that you had with Chernyayev and the others. Many thanks to [PCI Secretary General] Mr Occhetto and your party comrades for the assessments that they decided to present to us through you. They are very useful to us. We will take account of them, and we thank you particularly for the tact that you displayed by yourselves proposing to defer the commitment that I made to be the guest of the PCI." "Then," Rubbi said, "he asked me how things are going in Italy and what the weather is like. I, therefore, gave him a quick picture of the political situation, and of course we also discussed the weather. I explained to him that it is misty in the north but that the temperature in Rome is 23 degrees [centigrade]. 'Excellent,' he replied. 'Rome is a very fine city, but I also have to visit the north. Italians are very warm people. Just think: I was surprised by the welcome that I received in Finland, because of the people's great warmth. I told my aides: If this happens at the North Pole, can you imagine what will happen with the Italians?'"

[Foa] This unexpected meeting with Gorbachev was the culmination of your rapid visit to Moscow to meet with the Soviet leader's personal assistant, Chernyayev, and Deputy Foreign Minister Adamishin. Your mission precedes the visit that Gorbachev will be paying to Italy and is perhaps somewhat unusual. What is this, Mr Rubbi? Parallel diplomacy?

[Rubbi] No, it is simpler than that. At their meeting at the end of February in Moscow, Gorbachev spoke with Occhetto at length about his visit to Italy. He was clearly sorry that it had been talked about so much over the years without his ever having managed to achieve it. He was absolutely determined to do it this year, possibly in November, "as long," he said, "as international and domestic unrests do not put a spoke in our wheels again." If that did happen, he explicitly asked to be able to meet some time earlier in order to exchange assessments and opinions. My visit was in response to this request.

[Foa] What is discussed on such occasions?

[Rubbi] First, I tried to give him an idea of the climate of widespread expectancy and lively interest in Italy in connection with his visit. This, at all levels—from the supreme state institutions to the general public, from economic and trade sectors to the world of culture. And among political forces, both those of the government majority and the democratic opposition forces, starting with the PCI. Perhaps it was unnecessary, but I considered it opportune to stress that, with regard to the basic outlines of Italian foreign policy and the stance to be adopted with respect to the processes of democratic renewal and political and economic reform under way in some East European countries and the Soviet Union, there is significant and constructive agreement and cooperation among all the democratic forces, irrespective of their political and parliamentary orientation.

[Foa] We could say that this is, rather, the framework. There are many issues at stake. Which of them did you discuss?

[Rubbi] It is not difficult to identify them. The issues of disarmament, including the need to reach by next year in Vienna concrete results in the form of major conventional arms reductions; confidence-building measures and measures of detente and cooperation in the Mediterranean region; a qualitative step forward in relations of trade and cooperation both between individual countries and between the two sides of Europe; and the definition of the substance and future of the blueprint for the "common European home."

[Foa] Did you also discuss the itinerary for Gorbachev's 3-day visit to Italy?

[Rubbi] This is exclusively a matter for the two states and governments. I have no doubt that the itinerary will satisfy both sides' mutual interest. What I can say is that Gorbachev voiced his regret at not having the time for a longer visit "to the country to which I most want to return" and that he greatly appreciated the PCI's "tact" in having deferred until another occasion the mutual commitment made at the February meeting for him to be our party's guest some day.

[Foa] So he will not be visiting PCI headquarters but he will be seeing Occhetto again...

[Rubbi] It was Gorbachev who asked me to convey his greetings to Occhetto "until I see him again in Rome." He added: "Tell him that if time is short, it does not matter. If necessary I will see him even at night."

[Foa] Is the timetable for his visit to Italy still the same or has it been cut back because of Gorbachev's appointment with Bush?

[Rubbi] The timetable for his visit to Italy remains the same as previously planned. Of course, his subsequent meeting with U.S. President Bush in the Mediterranean is a very important event which has already kindled the interest of the world public. But the Soviet side intends to emphasize the unaltered importance of the visit to Italy, which constitutes a separate and extremely significant event within the context of bilateral relations and of European politics.

[Foa] You witnessed this emphasis on the Soviet side yourself. What are your expectations?

[Rubbi] Gorbachev was keen to stress to me—as Adamishin and Chernyayev previously did—that his visit to Italy completes his European year, which has included significant visits to the FRG, France, and, most recently, Finland. "We have outlined the foundations of the common European home," he told me, "and starting in Italy we can begin to lay the first bricks." My opinion is that in Italy the Soviet president will make statements of importance for the entire European continent and its future prospects. I observed respect for and appreciation of Italy's policy and its greater weight among its allies in Europe and within the more general context of international relations. Furthermore, bilateral relations between Italy and the Soviet Union should receive a strong boost. Our country already rates third among its economic and trade partners. But there is still broad scope for increasing trade and also for expanding scientific and cultural cooperation in order to strengthen political relations. Gorbachev's visit will impart a strong impetus to exploiting this scope. It seems to me that preparations for the visit are being aimed in this direction and appear very promising for both sides.

[Foa] There will also be the meeting with the pope, which I would say will be sensational and certainly spectacular. Did you talk about it?

[Rubbi] "Since you are both Slavs, you will eventually get along." I remember that this is what [former PCI Secretary General Alessandro] Natta told Gorbachev at their last meeting in March 1988, when talk first began about a possible conversation at the Vatican between the Soviet leader and John Paul II. Now I believe something more can be said, namely, that both sides are working to define a broad agenda, especially in connection with mankind's major problems. Because of the great responsibility borne by both sides and the influence that they exert in the world, this is certainly to be hoped for. They will definitely make concrete progress in relations between the Soviet Union and the Vatican, too, albeit in rather unusual ways.

FRG's Kohl Issues State of Nation Statement

LD0811205289 Moscow TASS in English 1828 GMT 8 Nov 89

[Text] Bonn November 8 TASS—Chancellor of the FRG Helmut Kohl made today in the Bundestag a Goverment statement on the state of the nation.

Noting that a process of cardinal political and economic changes is taking place in a number of East European socialist countries, he emphasized that for the first time since World War Two the perestroyka policy launched by General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev extends a justifiable hope for overcoming East-West conflict.

A prospect for broad evolution on the scale of a whole Europe and of the creation of peaceful order in Europe has opened, Kohl said.

"We intend to take every chance to contribute to the successful implementation of the process of reform in Eastern Europe", Kohl said.

He said that all Western countries are interested in the advance of this process. Therefore all members of the European Community and partners in the North Atlantic Alliance are called upon to promote this process through cooperation, Kohl said.

In connection with his forthcoming visit to Poland, the chancellor said that together with the head of the Polish Government he intends to lay down the foundations for the common future of the German and the Polish peoples.

Kohl confirmed that Bonn continues to adhere to the spirit and the letter of the treaty concluded with Poland which confirmed the inviolability of the existing frontiers and West Germany's and Poland's joint refraining from territorial claims now and in the future. At the same time the chancellor noted that a peace treaty is still lacking.

Expressing the readiness to cooperate with the GDR leadership in environmental protection, and in combatting drug addiction, in the development of cultural, sports and other ties with the GDR, Kohl stated that Bonn, at the same time, does not intend to recognize citizenship of the GDR and put up for long with the existence of two states in Germany.

Comments on East Europe Developments

PM0911095789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
9 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report under the general heading "Stop Press"]

[Text] Bonn, 8 Nov—FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl delivered a government statement today in the Bundestag "On the State of the Nation." Indicating that a process of radical political and economic transformations is taking place in a number of socialist countries in Eastern Europe, he stressed that the perestroyka policy initiated by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has provided a well-founded hope for the first time since World War II that the East-West conflict may be overcome.

There is the prospect of broad evolution throughout Europe and the creation of a peaceful European order, the chancellor stressed. We intend to take every opportunity to contribute to the successful implementation of the reform processes in Eastern Europe.

In connection with his impending visit to Poland, the chancellor said that he intends to "lay the foundations for a joint future for the German and Polish peoples" with the head of the Polish Government. Kohl confirmed that Bonn still adheres to the spirit and the letter of its treaty with Poland, which confirms the inviolability of existing borders and the mutual renunciation by the FRG and Poland of territorial claims both now and in the future.

Expressing readiness to cooperate with the GDR leadership in the sphere of environmental protection and the fight against drug addiction and his readiness to develop cultural, sporting, and other ties with the GDR, H. Kohl said at the same time that Bonn has no intention of resigning itself in the long term to the existence of two German states.

FRG Caution About Immigrants From GDR Noted

PM0911084789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
7 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report incorporated in column under the general heading "IZVESTIYA Correspondents Comment—GDR"]

[Text] Berlin, 6 Nov—The GDR press is focusing on the very restrained attitude in the FRG toward receiving new immigrants from the GDR, supporting this with concrete statements from West German politicians. Thus, O. Lafontaine, prime minister of Saarland, advocated "restricting immigration from the East.' In an interview with the magazine BUNTE, as ADN reported from Bonn, he called activity aimed at attracting to the FRG "people who cannot obtain housing or work here" irresponsible.

J. Rau, prime minister of North Rhine-Westphalia, pointed out the acute problems connected with the arrival in the FRG of new immigrants from the GDR. According to him, the FRG is not at all ready to receive the people arriving from the GDR. Problems are arising which certain leaders in Bonn have no idea how to solve.

E. Breit, chairman of the West German trade union association, also warned the immigrants about excessive illusions. Speaking at a trade union congress in Mannheim, he stated that all the people arriving in the FRG must be clearly told that "our part of Germany is not a paradise and they will have a hard struggle to obtain material prosperity and social security."

FRG Poll Shows Increased Trust in Soviet Union

PM0911125989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[Own Correspondent Ye. Grigoryev article: "FRG: Confidence in USSR Growing"]

[Text] Bonn, 8 Nov—Respect for and confidence in the Soviet Union, its leadership, and its policy continue to grow among the FRG population.

That was shown by a recent public opinion poll conducted by the Emnid Institute in Bielefeld. Some 89 percent of West German citizens polled consider the process of reforms in the Soviet Union and the peace-loving efforts of Soviet foreign policy sincere. That is 7 percent more than a year ago. "Confidence in Soviet policy in our country has never been so high," is DIE WELT's verdict. According to the poll's results, the vast majority of the FRG population attach exceptional importance to disarmament talks and see them as a direct path to the reduction of the danger of war. Some 72 percent of West Germans hold to that opinion and only around 40 percent believe that a world war is still possible or likely. At the same time there has been a significant increase in the number of people in the country who no longer believe in the "communist threat." The poll confirms that the enemy image is continuing to diminish. Only 19 percent of those polled now believe in it. Last year that figure was 25 percent.

The vast majority of West Germans support their country's membership in NATO and think that the U.S. troops should remain in the FRG. The participants in the poll favored the reduction of military spending, which is directly linked to the hopes that many people here pin on the disarmament process in Europe.

USSR-FRG Banking Commission Meets in Frankfurt

PM0811143989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Ye. Grishin dispatch: "Financiers' Mutual Interest"]

[Text] Frankfurt—FRG and Soviet banks play a notable role in the development of business cooperation between the two countries. A routine session of the Soviet-West German Banking Commission has been held in Frankfurt.

Our banking system has long been isolated from the international financial world. That is why we must now make up for lost time as quickly as possible, acquire experience, and find new partners, Yu.S. Moskovskiy, head of the Soviet delegation and chairman of the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity Board, noted. Our bank maintains agency [korrespondentskiy] relations with approximately 100 West German partners. Alongside traditional financial deals, both sides are seeking new forms of cooperation. Thus, for instance, the Westdeutsche Landesbank has helped us to organize a 100 million Swiss franc loan issue. This operation was successfully carried out in Switzerland last year. The other day saw the appearance of the first financial joint venture—the International Moscow Bank. Three Soviet banks and five West European banks—from France, the FRG, Austria, Italy, and Finland—are taking part in it.

An important task for the new bank is to provide support in setting up joint ventures. It was noted at the commission session that this new form of cooperation is developing successfully. More than 1,000 joint ventures have already been registered in the USSR, 150 involving West German firms. The state of affairs with regard to the implementation of plans in the Soviet light and food industries was also examined, as was the assimilation of raw-material resources on the Kola Peninsula. Firms and banks from the FRG, France, Italy, Belgium, and the Scandinavian countries are showing interest in participating in these deals.

"The commission has been productive," Wolfgang Roeller, the well-known West German banker and cochairman of the commission, said. "You get the feeling that perestroyka in the Soviet Union is increasingly imbuing the sphere of foreign economic relations too. This is proved by the considerable galvanization of the commercial activities of the USSR and the other CEMA countries in the European market. In the first half of this year trade turnover between the socialist countries and the FRG increased by almost 30 percent compared with the same period of 1988. But the potential for expanding trade and economic cooperation has by no means been exhausted—after all, the FRG's trade turnover with the East European states amounts to just 5 percent of total West German trade."

The FRG bank representatives are also positive about the proposal to organize training and exchanges of financial specialists between our countries and to hold joint seminars. Good knowledge of each other is the guarantee of successful cooperation.

Latin America & Caribbean

Supreme Soviet Delegation Visits Guatemala

Meets President Cerezo

PM0811145989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS special correspondent dispatch: "Supreme Soviet Delegation in Guatemala"]

[Text] Guatemala, 3 Nov—On Thursday President Vinicio Cerezo of Guatemala received a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by M.I. Snegur, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is here on an official visit at the invitation of the Guatemalan National Congress.

Vinicio Cerezo greeted the USSR people's deputies, the first delegation of Soviet parliamentarians to pay an official visit to this country. He noted that for several years now Guatemala has steered a course geared to developing relations with all the world's countries.

The head of the Soviet delegation spoke about the process of perestroyka which is under way in the USSR and about the work of people's deputies in the elaboration of legislation aimed at democratization.

M.I. Snegur expressed appreciation to the Guatemalan side for the cordial reception and the provision of the

Soviet delegation with conditions enabling it to acquaint itself with Guatemala, the life of its people, and its ancient culture.

We are seeking peace in Central America, the president of Guatemala stressed. And, of course, the efforts to achieve this peace in our region presuppose our support for all initiatives aimed at strengthening peace throughout the planet. The relaxation of international tension will unquestionably contribute to ensuring a stable and lasting peace in Central America.

In order to live in peace, he continued, it is necessary to communicate, to study the experience of other countries, and to strengthen the bonds of solidarity and political and economic cooperation. The political conditions in Guatemala make it possible to strengthen relations with those states with whom our stances coincide. In this context the president rated highly the importance of the Soviet parliamentarians' visit to Guatemala.

On the same day a working meeting between the USSR people's deputies and the leadership of the Guatemalan National Congress was held.

In the course of the meeting both sides drew attention to the coincidence of the beginning of the changes in Guatemala and the USSR—1985—and of the problems which are arising in the path of their implementation. The lawmakers pointed out the existing reserves for stepping up and expanding trade exchanges on a mutually advantageous basis. They expressed themselves in favor of the promotion of this process by parliamentarians from both countries with a view to improving bilateral cultural and political ties.

Ariel Rivera Irias, Guatemalan minister of foreign relations, declared at a meeting with the Soviet delegation:

Your visit has become possible as a result of the policy of greater openness conducted by the current Guatemalan Government and the emergence from isolation which is supported by the Congress, and also thanks to the new political thinking displayed by the Soviet Union which is influencing not just the mutual relations between the two superpowers but the entire range of international relations.

Joint Report on Visit

PM0911100189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

["Joint Report on USSR Supreme Soviet Delegation's Visit to Guatemala"]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation comprising M.I. Snegur, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR People's Deputies V.A. Kiseleva and V.I. Ogarok, paid an official visit to Guatemala 31 October through 3 November 1989 at the invitation of the Guatemalan Congress.

The Soviet parliamentarians were met at the airport by Marco A. Dardo Castillo, first vice chairman of the Guatemalan Congress, and members of the foreign affairs commission.

Meetings were held with Guatemalan President Marco Vinicio Cerezo Arevalo, Congress Chairman Jose F. Lobo Dubon, Foreign Minister Ariel Rivera Irias, and other officials.

The Soviet delegation toured the country, visited the town of Antigua-Guatemala, and saw the sights of the capital.

The talks, which were held in a businesslike and frank atmosphere, discussed topical international problems and issues of bilateral relations. Information was exchanged on the work of the two countries' parliamentarians.

The Guatemalan Congress deputies talked about the activities of their country's legislative organ and gave information on the situation in Guatemala, the tasks of development in the economic and social spheres, and democratization processes.

The Soviet representatives talked about the current stage of perestroyka in the USSR and the work of the new USSR Supreme Soviet. It was stressed that the fundamental reforms being implemented in the political, socioeconomic, legal, spiritual, and other spheres in the Soviet Union are aimed at ensuring extensive democratization, developing glasnost, renewing all aspects of Soviet society's life, and making society's development dynamic and effective. It was also stressed that the domestic restructuring processes are indissolubly linked with the USSR's principled foreign policy line of strengthening universal peace and security based on the principles of new political thinking.

The Guatemalan parliamentarians' attention was drawn to the Soviet Union's initiatives aimed at the phased reduction and complete elimination of nuclear weapons, the banning of other kinds of mass destruction weaponry, the creation of a reliable system of universal security, the strengthening of confidence-building measures between states, and the prevention of ecological catastrophe.

During the exchange of opinions on the situation in the world the sides expressed identical [sovpadayushchiye] opinions that the current international situation is typified by the strengthening of positive trends and the coordination and development of multilateral contacts and collaboration between different political and social forces. The growing role played by parliaments in seeking ways to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, to achieve lasting peace, and to strengthen international cooperation was stressed. These highly important tasks authoritatively dictate the need for vigorous action by all states, irrespective of their geographic position and political system.

The Soviet and Guatemalan parliamentarians noted with satisfaction the presence of certain improvements in the resolution of a number of regional conflicts and expressed the need to eliminate all centers of tension in the world which bring with them a constant threat to peace and to the peoples' independence and sovereignty. Mutual understanding was expressed of the fact that not confrontation but dialogue based on a balance of all parties' interests and respect for the right of all peoples to freely choose their path of development should be the only way of solving international problems and overcoming regional crises.

During a discussion of the situation in Central America the sides expressed satisfaction at the fact that fundamentally important agreements which open up specific ways to bring about a just resolution of the regional conflict have been worked out thanks to the realism displayed by the presidents of the five Central American countries and their understanding of the need to settle the crisis exclusively by peaceful means and on the basis of mutually acceptable compromise and consideration for each other's legitimate interests. The importance of the Central American states' striving for cooperation with the United Nations in resolving a number of practical issues of peaceful settlement was stressed.

The two countries' parliamentarians expressed support for the talks process taking place within the framework of the meetings between the presidents of Central American countries in the spirit of the Guatemalan accords, and for the complete fulfillment of the agreements reached in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras. It was stressed that these agreements reflect the political will of the region's peoples. The Soviet delegation members stated the USSR's readiness to continue to actively promote an improvement of the situation in Central America and to assert peace, good-neighborliness, and equal cooperation based on unconditional respect for the spirit and letter of the accords reached by the region's heads of state.

The sides reaffirmed their conviction about the need to establish a new world economic order and ensure a just solution to the foreign debt problem taking account above all of the developing countries' needs. The mutual opinion was expressed that it is impermissible to use economic and financial levers as tools of political pressure. It was noted that the interests of the socioeconomic and cultural development—above all, developing states—would be served by channeling into these areas the enormous funds which would be released in the process of disarmament.

The Soviet and Guatemalan parliamentarians advocated the enhancement in every possible way of the UN role in solving the global problems facing mankind of preserving peace and strengthening security, as well as in the economic, humanitarian, ecological, and human rights spheres.

The Guatemalan Congress and USSR Supreme Soviet deputies expressed mutual interest in stepping up parliamentary exchanges and making them stable and regular. They advocated the organization of dialogue between our countries and the development of mutually advantageous contacts in the trade, economic, cultural, and other spheres.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation expressed gratitude to the Guatemalan parliamentarians and the authorities for their hospitality and conveyed an invitation to the Guatemalan Congress to send a delegation on an official visit to the Soviet Union at a convenient time for both sides. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

End of 12-Month Truce in Nicaragua Analyzed

PM0811105589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
8 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Gennadiy Zafesov under the rubric "Viewpoint": "Enforced Step"]

[Text] The truce in Nicaragua lasted 12 months. And now shots are being heard again in that Central American country. The Sandinista People's Army has begun active offensive operations against the Contras. What has forced the country's leaders to take this step?

The answer is unequivocal: The rebels' more frequent onslaughts and their provocative attempts to move combat operations back deep within the republic's territory, as they did a few years ago. Yet, according to the accords of the presidents of five Central American states, the counterrevolutionary formations on the territory of Honduras should be disarmed and deported to third countries. Understandably, the mercenaries' morale is low. Considering that the United States has cast them to the tyranny of fate, the "Nicaraguan resistance," as we can see, has decided to finally slam the door.

Actually, the activation of the rebels did not begin yesterday. Incidentally, the republic's government has displayed restraint long enough in the face of such overt, blatant acts of provocation. But it can be patient no longer; after all, the blood of innocent people is being shed. From that viewpoint, the offensive which has been launched against the contras seems to me an entirely justified and logical response. It must be noted that at the same time the Nicaraguan leadership has also taken a number of diplomatic steps aimed at the peaceful solution of the problem.

At the same time, some elements give rise to concern for the situation as a whole. Above all, it is hard to predict how the present turn in the development of events will be reflected on the overall process of normalization in the country. As for the opposition, it is probably using the fact of the government offensive for unseemly propaganda purposes. But in the end, you cannot pay with people's lives for a semblance of wellbeing.

I shall not venture to judge whether the Contras, in resuming their bandit operations, have really left the subordination of their U.S. patrons, who today are no longer fighting, at least publicly, for the continuation of the "undeclared war." But I do not rule out the possibility that there are political forces in the United States which benefit from the rebels' bellicosity. After all, it is no secret that among U.S. ruling circles there is no single approach toward a Nicaraguan settlement. But irrespective of nuances in views of the problem, Washington's actions objectively complicate the normalization process.

Here is just one testimony to this destructive policy. Some $9 million were earmarked for financing the Nicaraguan opposition forces' election campaign. I think that the anger with which this "injection" was received in official circles in Managua was entirely right. I would be curious to know how the United States would react if it suddenly learned that the election campaign of some U.S. party was being financed by another state? Such a thing would probably be nipped in the bud. But it turns out that it is possible to violate Nicaragua's sovereignty in such an overt way. And, most striking, with the approval of U.S. congressmen! Actually, perhaps we should not be that surprised. After all, in the recent past they were unstinting in providing money for the Contras.

To be fair, I should note that among the U.S. legislators there are people who assess the situation realistically. In particular, Senator Brock Adams says: "I think we should not interfere in Nicaragua, either with the aid of bullets or with the aid of ballots." It is a pity that, to judge by the decisions which are being taken on the Potomac, the sober-minded U.S. legislators remain in the minority.

Well, in Nicaragua itself the obvious link between the activation of the legal opposition and the actions of the armed gangs can be traced increasingly clear. The former and the latter have a graphically expressed anti-Sandinista orientation. Understandably, it is not compulsory to have sympathy for a political opponent, but why is it necessary to terrorize future voters? According to the figures of the republic's Supreme Electoral Council, about 8,000 Nicaraguans were unable to register because of attacks by contras which in fact compelled the authorities to close a number of polling stations.

To judge by press reports, U.S. diplomatic circles understand that the situation which has taken shape could defer the Nicaraguan elections indefinitely. If the Washington Administration really wants free and democratic elections to take place in Nicaragua, then it must first of all use its influence to curb the contras. But that is not what it looks like. In any case, President G. Bush has stated that the United States "retains the right to choose." And that this choice can be highly idiosyncratic is borne out if only by the resolution of the U.S. House of Representatives earmarking "humanitarian aid" for the contras worth $4 million a year. So the rebels were obviously wrong to feel resentful of their patrons. You will agree that with this money there is no need to rush to surrender their weapons.

One way or another, the process of a Central American settlement has again been seriously threatened. The blame for that rests with those who prefer to resolve political problems on the battlefield and, of course, those who are their patrons.

Political & Social

Coal Industry Minister Meets Vorkuta Miners

PM0811164989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by own correspondent Viktor Filippov under the rubric "Direct Line: IZVESTIYA Correspondents at the Teleprinter": "Invitation to Dialogue"]

[Text] Vorkuta—A meeting of the city's party and economic aktiv has been held here to which M. Shchadov, minister of the coal industry, and Yu. Spiridonov, first secretary of the Komi Oblast CPSU Committee, were invited. There was a discussion of the alarming situation at the mines. The Vorkuta miners' strike is causing the state colossal losses. The work of the Cherepovets and Novyy Lipetsk metallurgical combines and the Northern railroad has been complicated. And the enterprises of the Komi republic itself felt the stoppages in fuel deliveries painfully with the very first frosts.

"The workers' committees have shown their real strength," Yu. Spiridonov said, addressing the leaders of the city and mine strike committees sitting in the hall. "Now let us think hard about how to proceed. There is a suitable way out of the strike; in his letter to the labor collectives of the country's coal basins, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, issues an invitation to dialogue. Is that not an opportunity for a sensible compromise?"

Minister M. Shchadov confirmed the government's readiness for constructive dialogue with the workers. In particular he assured the miners that before their representatives' 17 November meeting with the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, the departmental "charter on discipline" will be repealed and the question of the unconditional retention of Northern allowances will be resolved when miners resign of their own accord or for other good reasons. Henceforth, the minister stressed, the mines' labor collectives will receive detailed reports every month on the progress in fulfilling the USSR Council of Ministers resolution No 608.

The miners' reaction to this proposal—to move from a strike to constructive dialogue with the government—was not uniform. Some of those assembled in the hall applauded in support of A. Prasolov, director of the "Zapolyarnaya" mine, who stated that the strike is harmful to the workers' movement in favor of perestroyka (as is well known, of the 13 mines of the "Vorkutaugol" association only the "Zapolyarnaya" is mining coal and shipping it to consumers on a stable basis right now). But some of those present left the hall as a sign of their disagreement with this position. The majority, although they criticized the actions of the leaders of the city, republic, and union ministries, did not reject the proposal for dialogue.

Now it all comes down to whether the Vorkuta miners will end their strike. After the meeting of the party and economic aktiv, the ministers, the leaders of the republic and the city, and representatives of the strike committees left for the miners' collectives. The dates of 7 and 8 November were holidays at the "Vorkutaugol" association mines. Only repair work was done. It is the miners' custom to prepare the longwalls on leave days and holidays for the continuous extraction of coal. Will the miners begin work after the holidays? No one in Vorkuta could answer this question for me yet...

Vorkuta Union Signs Contract With Strikers

PM0711140189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Unattributed report under the general heading "On the Situation in the Pechora Coalfield": "Surprising Contract"]

[Text] The alarming reports from Vorkuta are bound to be food for thought. The first and most obvious thought is that the miners' demands are largely dictated by the unsatisfactory working and living conditions which have accumulated over the years. Administrative diktat, the departmental monopoly on economic initiative, and the worker's alienation from the results of his labor—all this cannot fail to arouse dissatisfaction.

It is common knowledge that the pace of radical economic reform does not satisfy us all, that we all want it to be accelerated. But can the means chosen by the strikers be called effective? Hardly. Stopping the labor process has never solved any problems, but only created new ones. Besides, the forms of parliamentary struggle for radical economic reform have not been exhausted. The USSR Supreme Soviet is getting ready to adopt the Law on Ownership, which will cover the whole range of problems raised by the miners. To treat just one sector is to engage in self-deception.

The facts of active participation in the Vorkuta strike by people not directly linked with the Pechora coalfield raise even more serious questions.

Thus, for example, as the editorial office found out, a "Contract on Socialist Cooperation Between the Vorkuta City Strike Committee and the USSR Union of Cooperative Members" was signed 31 October in Vorkuta. We shall cite the text of it in full:

"The Vorkuta City Workers (Strike) Committee, hereinafter called 'the committee,' in the person of Committee Chairman Comrade V.G. Gobrusev, acting on the basis of its statutes, on the one hand, and the USSR Union of United Cooperative Members, hereinafter called 'the union,' in the person of Union Vice President Comrade A.M. Tarasov, acting on the basis of its statutes, on the other hand, have concluded the present contract on the following:

"1. To pursue by joint efforts and all available means the struggle to eliminate the bureaucratic administrative apparatus' monopoly in the sphere of management, the distribution of resources, the distribution of profit and other influences on worker collectives and cooperatives.

"2. To explain to the population the real aims sought by the committee and the union: People's rights to work freely, independently distribute the results of their labor, and secure social justice in all spheres of life.

"3. The union pledges to examine the question of allocating funds from the USSR Union of United Cooperative Members to support the legitimate struggle by the miners of Vorkuta and the country's other regions for their rights.

"4. The committee and the union support the platform of the Interregional Group of Deputies, assist in every possible way the nomination of candidate people's deputies for okrugs and sections, campaign among the population during the election campaign, and aid progressively minded representatives of the miners and cooperative members in the elections.

"5. The union and the committee resolve questions concerning the propaganda of their movements: The union allocates a page of its all-union newspaper to the committee for publishing any material connected with the struggle by the strike committees and miners for their rights, and, where possible, supplies the committee with duplicating equipment, communication facilities, and computer equipment.

"6. The union gives miners assistance with foreign trade consultations, the sale of above-plan coal on the external market, and the import on hard-currency contracts of consumer goods, equipment, medical centers, medicine and other materials needed by the miners at the request of the committee and mine workers.
"[Signed] A.M. Tarasov, for the union.
V.G. Gobrusev, for the committee."

This unusual document requires commentary. Is there any need to recall that IZVESTIYA has always consistently and vigorously supported and continues to support the cooperative movement and has defended and continues to defend it. No one can deny this. But such active "involvement" by the USSR Union of Cooperative Members in the miners' strike scarcely has any relevance to the cooperative movement and is perplexing. Is it right to add clearly political demands to the miners' urgent socioeconomic demands? To put forward tasks which cannot be solved overnight, especially by means of a strike? And, most importantly, the same tasks as are being solved during perestroyka anyway... Do the miners expect such support? And has this document been signed with their common consent? Does the USSR Union of Cooperative Members agree with this "involvement in politics"? Or, perhaps, it all hinges on paragraph six of the contract cited above, whereby all distributive relations in the region can be controlled?

We all have something to think about. To think about calmly, cautiously, and responsibly, trusting reason and not emotions.

We are going through difficult times. Perhaps the most difficult in the 4 ½ years of perestroyka. Any false, rash step may have consequences fatal to our common cause.

Ryabev on Meeting Miners' Demands

904F0015A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 1 Nov 89 p 1

[Report on interview by V. Kremer with L.D. Ryabev- ,Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and Chairman of the Council of Ministers' Bureau for the Fuel and Energy Complex: "The Miners' Demands: How Are They Being Met?"; date and place not specified]

[Text] Late on the evening of 3 August, N.I. Ryzhkov signed Resolution No 608, a promissory note of sorts issued by the supreme executive authority to the participants in the July strikes of miners which have aroused our country. During this fall, the control deadline for executing many decisions set forth in joint protocols of government commissions and strike committees is to expire. What has been actually accomplished in the past incomplete 3 months? Our correspondent has approached Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Chairman of the Bureau of the Council of Ministers for the Fuel and Energy Complex L.D. Ryabev for a response to this question.

[Kremer] Lev Dmitriyevich, to begin with, it would perhaps be worthwhile to provide some general data on how the government is meeting its obligations. Would you have them?

[Ryabev] Certainly. On 1 October, the deadline expired for fulfilling 344 assignments and tasks set by government commissions which visited coal regions at the height of the strikes. Actually, 381 points of coordinated protocols have been executed. Concerning Resolution No 608, the picture is as follows: Actually, 140 tasks have been accomplished whereas 96 assignments have been planned for that date. If we were to be completely precise, we should say that, despite 93 items of the general demand package being "closed" before the deadline, a delay with regard to a number of points has been allowed to occur (provision of cars for the loading of coal in a timely manner, supply of mine props, and others).

I would like to stress that the execution of joint decisions is strictly controlled. Central ministries and departments and local organs regularly report on the work completed. All of the data are submitted to the USSR Glavinform [Main Administration for Information]. At the Glavinform, they are processed and materials necessary for the monthly report to the USSR Council of Ministers are prepared.

[Kremer] Recently, the first meeting of the social commission for monitoring the meeting of miners' demands which was set up at the central committee of the coal workers trade union was held with your active participation. I don't know about you, but it seems to me that the representatives of strike and workers' committees who arrived in Moscow do not quite trust the calculations of the apparatus. Therefore, if you do not object, let us switch from abstract numbers to facts.

[Ryabev] I will begin with the issue which was raised particularly often at the meetings—paying for the time which the miners spend for traveling from the shaft to the face. This demand has been met.

As long as 2 years ago, a resolution was adopted on bonuses for those working on the evening and night shifts from the funds generated by enterprises. However, it did not affect the miners and mine construction personnel because such funds could not be found in their industry. At present, bonuses from the state budget have been introduced: Miners get 20 percent of their pay grade or salary for work on the evening shift, and 40 percent for work on the night shift.

Coal miners of a number of regions insisted on increasing regional wage coefficients. Their demands were also met. In Kemerovo Oblast, a regional coefficient of 1.3 was set, in Inta, 1.5, in Vorkuta, 1.6, and in the settlement of Khalmer-Yu, 1.7. In principle, the issue of regional bonuses for the miners of Karaganda, the same as for the inhabitants of Kemerovo, was resolved. They will be introduced effective the 2d quarter of next year.

On the average, a considerable increase in wages is expected for every employee of the industry given the regular operation of enterprises. The allocation for increasing the labor remuneration fund of the coal industry amounts to R517,600 million; annualized additional expenditures of the state budget will exceed R1 billion. Believe me, it was not easy for the government to find this tremendous sum for new bonuses and preferences for the miners. After all, the industry receives over R6billion in subsidies annually on top of that.

[Kremer] Judging by the letters and phone calls to the editorial office, the miners are showing heightened interest in the new legislation on retirement benefits. They are concerned about whether the demands of miners have been taken into account in the draft Law on Retirement Benefits as promised.

[Ryabev] Yes, they have. The draft Law on Retirement Benefits for Citizens which was developed jointly by the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Issues and the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] was considered at the meeting of the Council of Ministers. A debate on preferential retirement benefits for those employed in production in a difficult and harmful environment ensued in the course of the discussion. It was resolved that there must be a unified approach to the system of preferential retirement benefits regardless of the ministerial affiliation of the enterprise. Special preferences are provided for the employees of the coal industry taking into account the peculiarities of work in this industry.

The draft provides for retirement regardless of age after a tenure of 25 years with the payment of up to 70 percent of average earnings depending on the size of the latter for those employed in underground and strip mining work. It is planned to envisage retirement benefits of up to 60 percent of average earnings after 20 years of tenure beginning at age 45 for miners of the breakage face, drifters, and operators of mining extraction machines. Other preferences concerning which an agreement was secured in the course of negotiations with strike committees are also included.

Several days ago, the draft of the new law on retirement benefits was submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet. It is scheduled for consideration by the current session.

[Kremer] How is the work on the law on leaves progressing?

[Ryabev] The State Committee for Labor and Social Issues developed a draft and submitted it to the Council of Ministers. The draft was approved at the meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers on 28 October. Within days, it will be referred to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

This draft reflects the demands of labor collectives which were set forth in coordinated protocols. In particular, it is envisaged to increase the total maximum duration of leave for workers employed underground in jobs with a particularly harmful labor environment from 39 to 57 days. It is allowed to use the leave piecemeal and grant leave without pay to the employees of coal enterprises of the Far North for the time necessary for traveling to the location of recreation and back.

[Kremer] Along with the issues of remuneration for labor and increases in retirement benefits, the miners also raised other issues sharply: giving the enterprises economic independence, reducing the managerial apparatus, changing the entire system of management in the industry. All of this has also been set forth in Resolution No 608. How is this segment of the program being fulfilled?

[Ryabev] Coal mines and strip mines have been given the right to switch to complete independence with all the provisions of the Law on State Enterprises applying to them. By now, about 200 mines, opencast mines, and other enterprises have taken advantage of this right. They are authorized to sell at contract prices in the domestic and foreign market the coal produced above the state order after deliveries by virtue of direct contracts have been made. A 20 percent standard rate of withholding from the proceeds from coal exports has been set. The enterprises are authorized to set output norms, pay scales, and servicing norms independently.

The decision to eliminate territorial main administrations has been made. Reductions in the managerial apparatus are under way: in the ministry and the associations—by about one-third, and at the mines by 20 percent. Proposals are being developed on setting up in

1989 voluntary associations in the industry on the basis of various forms of property—state, joint-stock, cooperative, and leased.

In this instance, we should note one detail. In a number of areas, labor collectives are in no hurry to switch to economic accountability. One of the reasons is found in the fact that they just cannot afford independence. A considerable number of mines have low profit margins or operate at a loss.

[Kremer] Perhaps, increasing wholesale prices with a view to the miners earning "their keep" themselves rather than receiving subsidies is a radical way out.

[Ryabev] The radical way out for both the coal industry personnel and the entire national economy is found in a considerable increase in labor productivity. After all, the productivity of labor in the mines of our country is 7 times lower than in the United States. This gap may only be closed on the basis of new equipment, advanced technology, and modern organization of labor. Primarily, it is the science of our industry and machine building for the coal industry that should make a contribution.

At the same time, certain initial conditions must be provided by enterprises with a view to speeding up such work. Effective 1 October, the so-called settlement prices for coal were increased with a view to covering additional outlays entailed by the implementation of an expanded social program. Additional adjustments in settlement prices will be carried out next year as well.

At the same time, proposals on new coal prices, which exceed the current level by a factor of more than 2, have been developed. They are going to take into account land reclamation expenses and changes in the mining and geological conditions for production. New coal prices will be implemented in the course of carrying out a reform of wholesale prices for the entire industrial output produced in the national economy. This reform has been tentatively scheduled for the beginning of the 13th 5-year plan.

[Kremer] By now, the situation in a number of coal regions has become acute again. The miners of Mezdurechensk went on a warning strike; the largest mine of Vorkuta, the "Vorgashorskaya," is not working. Our correspondents report that the collectives are concerned about the lack of information on the measures taken by the government. The rumors are circulating to the effect that the miners have simply been cheated. Could it be that it is in somebody's interest to fuel passions?

[Ryabev] I do not believe that this involves anybody's malicious intent. Until recently, most of the miners indeed knew little about what was happening at the highest level of management. However, in mid-October detailed information was forwarded to all collectives of the coal industry. I would also like to note that no clear complaints from the miners of Vorkuta have been received with regard to which specific points of Resolution No 608 are not being fulfilled.

Recently, I have met many activists of the workers' and strike committees together with Minister [of the Coal Industry] M.I. Shchadov. An in-depth discussion of literally every point of Resolution No 608 was held on 17 October at the meeting of the commission of the central committee of the trade union with about 100 representatives of miners' collectives in attendance, including USSR people's deputies and members of the Supreme Soviet. The minutes of this meeting were signed by the members of the working commission and disseminated to all coal basins. We will hold such meetings regularly.

We are also thinking about other measures aimed at improving information. Let us hope that this interview of ours will help in clarifying the situation with meeting the demands of miners.

Riga Gorkom Hits Critics of October Revolution

PM0811095589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Irina Litvinova Riga dispatch under the rubric: "Direct Line": "Riga City Party Committee Appeal"]

[Text] The Riga City Party Committee [gorkom] Bureau has issued an appeal. It reads in part: "In recent days materials belittling the the role of our revolution and effectively calling for a boycott of the 72d anniversary of Great October have appeared in certain broadcasts of Latvian Radio and Television and the press. The stance of Communists on the board of the People's Front Duma, which actually initiated this campaign, is also evoking regret."

The decision of various divisions of the Latvian People's Front to ignore the state holiday and their categorical assessments have evoked bitterness among many of Latvia's inhabitants. People are telephoning the correspondent's office in puzzlement: "Since when are state holidays instituted or abolished by the Latvian People's Front? "Has anyone inquired about our feelings?" The assurance with which opinions are presented as the discovery of truth is astounding. In Yurmala, for instance, the People's Front board declared that the October Revolution was "a coup d'etat organized by the Bolshevik faction of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party which put an end to the process of democratization in Russia which had begun after the 1917 February Revolution."

The board divides the inhabitants of Yurmala into "progressively thinking people"—that is those who support the call "not to take part in the festive events devoted to the October Revolution—and the others. A similar criterion for determining "progressiveness" has also been put forward by other organizations of the People's Front.

The Riga party gorkom bureau has denounced these attempts, taking the view that they lead to another spiral of destabilization of the situation in the republic. All of us, the appeal says, must understand the immutable truth that is was precisely Great October which helped the Latvian people to acquire their statehood for the first time in their centuries' long history.

Commentary Views October Revolution Slogans

LD0911114189 Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 1 Nov 89

[Text] The central national papers have carried slogans by the Communist Party Central Committee for the 72nd anniversary of the Socialist Revolution in Russia. Yuriy Rogachev comments:

[Begin Rogachev recording] Such slogans are traditionally issued for the anniversaries of the revolution and May Day of international workers' solidarity. They spell out the guidelines of the Communist Party's home and foreign policies and define the major tasks facing society today. The slogans, that have just been published by this country's ruling party, are traditional and unordinary [as heard] at the same time. Sixteen slogans take up just several lines in three PRAVDA columns. Fairly recently such a publication occupied the whole of the front page in newspapers. The bureaucratic apparatus used to issue all kinds of slogans on who should do this or that, what should be done and when.

Now that perestroyka is under way people are trying to break many traditions left over from the old system, traditions that hindered renewal. They are trying to give up old stereotypes, too. The tradition of slogans has remained. Maybe for the time being. At least recently they've been reduced by nearly 50 percent annually. The basic slogans remain, among them those made during the revolution. The chief one, all power to Soviets, or governing bodies, is now as urgent as in those years. Setting up truly effective bodies of socialist democracy is one of the main goals of perestroyka. As for perestroyka itself the slogans describe it as a follow-up to Lenin's revolutionary cause.

On 25th October in 1917 by the old calendar, that is on 7th November by the new calendar, the Russian working people established their power of elective soviets. The working men and women dreamed of building a new society where working people could become real masters of the country's wealth and where no one could exploit anyone. A society of freedom, a society of social justice, a society that was the fondest dream of the humanists of various times in various nations. Lenin and the party he founded began to put this dream into reality on one-sixth of the planet for the first time in history.

Too bad that after Lenin's death Stalin, who usurped power in this country, flouted the principles and ideals of socialism and deformed them beyond recognition. But neither crude mistakes nor the flouting have forced the people off the way it chose in 1917. Perestroyka aims at ridding socialism of its deformation and moving forward toward renewal and at the same time aims at returning to the revolutionary ideals, ideals of genuinely human freedom, peoples' rule and social justice. The Soviet people celebrate the anniversary of their revolution in an atmosphere of true revolutionary renewal. [end recording]

Disturbances at Baltic October Celebrations

LD0911103289 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 8 Nov 89

[Text] The Sajudis Information Agency reports: Vilnius, 7 November—During the military parade celebrating the 72d anniversary of the Great October Revolution, about 50 members of the Geneva-49 committee of the Lithuanian Liberation League and other radicals formed a human chain in an attempt to obstruct the military hardware which was moving along Gediminas Avenue. The military vehicles had to stop for 1 minute. Thanks to the efforts of members of the KGB, the militia, and the Yedintsvo militia support groups, the demonstrators were removed from the street and the column of tanks moved on, accompanied by shouts of: Occupiers get out!, Red Army go Home! force was used to disperse the demonstrators.

Kishinev, 7 November—Although the Moldavian People's Front had protested the demonstration of military strength during the celebrations of the October revolution, the intention to include the military remained. The People's Front of Moldavia planned to mark this anniversary by marching in a separate column, and the local authorities gave their consent to this idea.

At about 0800, just 2 hours before the start of the official part of the celebrations, several buses drove up to the group of People's Front members. About 100 plainclothes men and officials began beating up the demonstrators trying to disperse them. Women and children were among those beaten up. However, during the period between the time of the incident and the opening of the military parade, more and more people joined the People's Front column. According to estimates there were about 5,000 people in the column. When people saw scattered boots and blood they began to run toward the military vehicles which were stationed at the end of Lenin Avenue. Having overcome the militia cordon, people climbed up on the tanks and began to chant: Down with Colonization! Down with communist dictatorship! The Red Army [word indistinct]!

The military parade was ruined and the Moldavian party authorities led by First Secretary Semyon Kuzmich Grossu, hurriedly left Lenin Avenue.

Leningrad—On 7 November at 0800 representatives of democratic movements were assembling to take part in the parade. About 20,000 people representing various movements begining with the Greens and ending with the anarchists formed a column organized by the Leningrad People's Front. The column took 40 minutes to pass the rostrum. Following this a rally was held outside the Lenin Komsomol theater. Speeches were made by USSR People's Deputies and by representatives of various movements.

There were many slogans both at the parade and the rally which expressed support to the Moscow group of deputies, Ivanov and Gdlyan, and demanding democracy and a multiparty system. There were few state flags of the USSR; Russian national flags tied with black ribbon were dominant at the parade and the rally, and the flags of the Baltic states, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, were also carried at the parade.

Lithuania's Prunskiene on Independence Issue

LD0111114189 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0100 GMT 31 Oct 89

[Report on interview with Kazimiera Prunskiene, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers and USSR Supreme Soviet people's deputy, by Vilnius Radio correspondent Roma Pakeniene; date and place of interview not given—Prunskiene remarks are recorded]

[Text] [R. Pakeniene] Today, as well as during every other week lately, Kazimiera Prunskine is taking part in the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow. She is a Supreme Soviet deputy. Kazimiera Prunskiene is the only representative of the Lithuanian Government in the Soviet Parliament, so there is no other person who would know better what direction the future of the Lithuanian economy and that of the entire Baltics is taking. Being aware of the real situation in Moscow, I believe that it is much easier to organize matters here in Lithuania.

The economic independence of Lithuania and its ties, abroad are among K. Prunskiene's responsibilities as a deputy chairman of the republic Council of Ministers. So, how are our matters developing in Moscow?

I would like to remind you that even before the Supreme Soviet session started it was reported that the law on Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian economic independence would begin to be discussed in mid-October and that the law would be adopted at the end of October or the beginning of November.

Well, we have reached the last days of October. However, discussion on the draft law has not yet begun. Perhaps this would not cause any concern if new tendencies did not emerge, which cause concern even among those Lithuanian deputies who are rather optimistic. According to K. Prunskiene, opinions in Moscow are becoming more and more polarized.

On the one hand the government is increasingly consolidating to contest our rights. This is illustrated solely by the fact that the discussion on essential economic issues has been practically transferred from the Parliament to the CPSU Central Committee, i.e. from the democratic environment to a conservative one. I have in mind the conference with Mikhail Gorbachev which took place last week where a considerable number of Supreme Soviet deputies took part. Another meeting has been planned for this week as well.

According to K. Prunskiene, the conservative environment of the Central Committee breaks some deputies' adherance to their principles. They begin to discuss alternative ideas for our independence. They are frightened by the possibility that the USSR may disintegrate after individual republics become economically independent.

On the other hand, until last week the deputies seemed to be fairly united, and matters looked likey they would be favorable resolved.

However, K. Prunskiene noted that the polarization of opinion was not the only obstacle the Baltic republics face.

[Prunskiene] These obstacles emanate from the USSR Law on Property which states that the land, natural recourses, and so- called basic branches, the most important branches of heavy industry, are the common property of the USSR or the property of the USSR and the republics.

We have a firm opinion. Therefore, we firmly demand that the republics, first of all, have the right to land and natural resources and to all state property. Hence the results of the discussion on these issues will virtually decide what the future of our law on economic independence will be.

However, the truth is that various possibilities could be introduced within the framework of the USSR laws. For individual republics the issue of USSR and republican property could be different. For example, if we demand that the right to property should be granted to us, this does not mean that this should automatically become valid in republics which do not want to have individual property rights and which agree to recognize the Soviet Union's right to property, even on their own territory. This is their own business.

However, as far as we are concerned we cannot recognize or agree with laws of this nature being passed. This would in fact mean the final destruction of the basis of economic independence and sovereignty. If we take part in the adoption of such a document this would then mean that we renounce the sovereignty of Lithuania by our own hand.

[Pakenine] I asked K. Prunskiene what the reaction of the Lithuanian deputies would be if, despite all the efforts, the position of the government would win and the right to property, land, and natural resources, would be granted to the USSR.

[Prunskiene] If a vote on the law with that wording is approaching, if the law under discussion is worded like that and is submitted to a vote, then we will have to protest. We will have to find a way to do it and we will have to withdraw our participation in the approval of such a document. Of course, it is difficult to imagine today what turn matters will take. But there is a realistic forecast that a very serious parliamentary crisis may occur."

[Pakeniene] This is K. Prunskiene's forecast on the USSR Law on Property. At the same time, acording to the deputy prime minister, at present it is impossible to tell what the final version of the law on economic independence of the Baltic republics will be. However, if the most important and crucial clauses are omitted, then we do not want such a law at all. And the most important matters are the following: the right of ownership to land and natural resources; the integrity of the Lithuanian economy; the right to control the republican economy at the state level; the right to independent foreign links; and the right to our own system of currency.

We would not be able to participate in the work of a parliament which completely ignores the right of nations to organize their life themselves, said K. Prunskiene. Does this mean that the Lithuanian deputies would return their mandates, I asked K. Prunskiene?

[Prunskiene] This can happen. I am not saying that this will happen by all means, but these issues are ripening today. The government is once again emphasizing the integrity of the territory of the USSR, the indivisibility of the property, including common property on land. All this indicates that the government, I would say is deliberately leading Parliament into a crisis.

If this law fails to be passed, then the conflict will naturally be shifted to a political level and then, in fact, a question of a very categorical nature, such as: Can Lithuania remain within the Soviet Union under such conditions? will emerge.

[Pakeniene] The idea that the issue of economic independence could turn into a poltiical issue has been voiced by K. Prunskiene before. However, I think that before she was only considering the possibility. Now she speaks about it more resolutely.

I can see, said the Lithuanian deputy prime minister, that the reactionary forces have consolidated very much and that the conflict is becoming more and more complex. But you have always been an optimist, I said to my esteemed interlocutoress. No, I have always been a realist, answered Kazimiera Prunskiene.

Lithuanian Deputies Protest CPSU Baltic Statement

90UN0142A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 11 Oct 89 p 3

["Statement of USSR People's Deputies from Lithuania"]

[Text] On 27 August 1989, the USSR central press and practically all the newspapers in the country published the Central Committee CPSU Statement "On the Situation in the Soviet Baltic Republics." With regard to the content of this statement, we express our categorical protest to this interpretation of the political situation which has arisen in the Baltic region, its nature and very tone.

1. The national self-consciousness of the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia is not a phenomenon which arose suddenly or in a void. It was a determining factor in the political life of our countries and, during the time of tsarism, led to the return or creation of state status for the three countries in 1918, a status unconditionally recognized by Soviet Russia in a treaty 2 February 1920 with Estonia, 12 July 1920 with Lithuania, and 20 August 1920 with Latvia. These treaties state, in part, that "Soviet Russia repudiates for all time any and all claims" to the territory of these three countries.

The national self-consciousness of our peoples has not diminished. It simply took on other forms of expression during the years of German occupation, Stalinist terror, and subsequent stages as well.

A strong will to live independently, without outside dictatorship, continues even today to remain the essence of the political process in the Baltic region.

2. The "Statement" passes over in silence the fact that the incorporation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, full-fledged members of the League of Nations, into the USSR was an illegal act committed in violation of international and state-to-state treaties. Our countries were occupied by armed force. Under conditions of occupation and terror, invalid elections were conducted and decisions made by a Sejm whose authority was not recognized by a single democratic state in the world.

3. The "Statement" provides disinformation to public opinion in the Soviet Union as to the nature and forms of the political process in the Baltic countries, confirming the presence of "hysterics," violence, "foisting slogans," and hostility towards people of other nationalities who have settled with us. In a demonstration 23 August 1989 two million people took part in the "Baltic Way," a human chain extending from Vilnius to Tallinn which included Russians, Belorussians, Ukrainians, Poles, and Jews. They were all met with flowers and applause. This demonstration on the largest scale proceeded in an organized fashion and without incident, showing the strong decisiveness of our entire population.

4. The "Statement" contains direct threats regarding Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. "Serious danger threatens the destiny of the Baltic peoples. People should know what kind of abyss their nationalist leaders are pushing them toward (...). The consequences could be catastrophic for these people. Their very viability could turn out to be in question." Turning to the women of the Baltic region, the authors of the "Statement" even allude to some kind of "calamity" that could "break out" among the children of our countries.

We have the right to ask—what do the authors of such statements have in mind? New repressions? We have already tested this on ourselves—one of every six Baltic people. The results are known.

The question of Lithuania, like that of the other two Baltic countries, must be resolved. Everyone is agreed on this. We propose to resolve it through peaceful, parliamentary means. We realize that the prestige and dignity of the Soviet Union are on the line. Resolution of the Baltic question through democratic means will be the most major contribution of the USSR in the post-war period to significantly improving the international climate, a decisive leap forward in imparting a new quality to it.

We note that the first step in this direction is already being taken—the economic independence of our three republics is on the agenda. We hope that the USSR government and its people's deputies resolutely cut short attempts by the central bureaucracy to paralyze this by a system of reservations and half-measures.

There are other signs as well which indicate that Moscow, and a broad strata of the USSR population, are beginning to understand the depth and seriousness of the Baltic question, its international nature.

We, the people's deputies from Lithuania, being in daily close contact with the population of our countries, in view of the absence at present of any other republic representatives elected by democratic means, declare:

I. The "Baltic Knot" can be unraveled only through direct negotiations by the parties concerned, under conditions of equal rights, the observance of international law, and repudiation of the use of force or threat to use force.

II. Any issue of interest to the parties may constitute the subject of negotiations: the essence, form, and effective term of treaties between Lithuania and the Soviet Union; the number, quality, status, and stationing location of Soviet Armed Forces on our land, and the duration of such stationing; rights and mutual privileges concerning the use of Baltic ports and lines of communication; trade, finance, humanitarian, and all other aspects.

III. The people's deputies are not authorized—and presently in Lithuania there is no structure nor authorized representatives—to conduct negotiations on one extremely important question: Independence or denial of independence.

This can be decided only by our people through a direct referendum. We are convinced that they will vote for a variation which is friendly in the right way to the Soviet Union. This would be proper, useful, and beneficial for all.

We are tied together not only by economics and geography—we are tied together by a common historical sorrow and a common striving to make the world, Eastern Europe in particular, a place where it is possible to live suitably.

We propose that this statement be published in the USSR press as a first step on the path to resolving the Baltic problems, and with the aim of creating a favorable atmosphere conforming to that of glasnost in the USSR, a factor so important in the process of genuine democracy.

[Signed] USSR people's deputies:

K. Antanavichyus, E. Bichkauskas, Yu. Bredikis, A. Burachas, A. Chekuolis, V. Chepas, S. Geda, B. Genzyalis, R. Gudaytis, Yu. Yuzelyunas, G. Kakaras, G. Konoplev, E. Klumbis, S. Kudarauskas, Yu. Kuplyauskene, A. Layus, V. Landsbergis, M. Laurinkus, V. Laurushas, Yu. Martsinkyavichyus, M. Martinaytis, N. Medvedev, A. Mitskis, O. Mitalene, K. Moteka, Yu. Olekas, R. Ozolas, A. Smaylis, V. Statulyavichyus, V. Tomkus, Z. Vayshvila, V. Velikonis, S. Kashauskas, K. Uoka, E. Vilkas, M. Visakavichyus, G. Baravikas, M. Stakvilyavichyus, Z. Shlichite, A. Yotsas.

The anxiety of USSR people's deputies concerning the sociopolitical situation in the republic is understandable, as is the matter of how it is assessed in the Central Committee CPSU Statement. However, several weeks have already passed since this statement was published. In the dynamics of today's political life the situation has changed significantly. Addressing the Central Committee CPSU Plenum 19 September on issues of interethnic relations, Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, noted that the processes which are taking place in the republic are not local phenomena—they reflect the deep-seated changes that are taking place in the party, in the entire country. Unusual and critical, they constitute one more argument prompting us to acknowledge this fact: political, economic, and social processes in Soviet Lithuania are becoming more intense.

It is now very important to seek positive decisions and points of contact with people in the CPSU leadership and USSR government who support the concept of Lithuania's political and economic independence, and in the USSR Supreme Soviet, where discussion will soon take place regarding the Law on the Economic Independence of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. The USSR people's deputies, properly representing the republic in the country's parliament, and all the inhabitants of Lithuania must show great flexibility, patiently explain their position, and persistently consolidate it. This always succeeds best when relationships in our modern society, already rather complex and full of contradictions, are not exacerbated.

Academician Vitautas Statulyavichyus, senior member of the group of USSR people's deputies from Lithuania, stated to the Lithuanian Telegraph Agency that the 2 October statement of the USSR people's deputies from the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic was delivered to M.S. Gorbachev, Central Committee CPSU general secretary and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. In the belief that the population of Lithuania should be informed concerning the activity of its deputies, the Lithuanian Telegraph Agency submitted the statement to the republic press.

Radio Interview With Lithuania's Brazauskas

LD0611114489

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1230 GMT on 3 November broadcasts an interview with Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, by Lithuanian radio commentator Benas Rupeika, given during the adjournment of the 3 November session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. The interview begins with Rupeika asking Brazauskas' views on the work of the session today. Brazauskas replies: "The most important item on the agenda is the law on citizenship. This question has been discussed before; it was published for public debate. The opinion of the people of Lithuania is serious and it has been evaluated and generalized. Debates on the issue have begun on the draft law on the citizenship. I understand that today we have all the possibilities to pass this law. I don not think the deputies will find serious reasons for asking the house to postpone the passing of this law.

"We understand what great responsibility falls upon all the commissions and on all the deputies of the Supreme Soviet because such a law has not been passed yet in any other republic, even in our neighboring republics, and considerable difficulties arise in this connection."

Brazauskas goes on to note: "However, a question which was widely discussed last time will no doubt arise today and this is the possibility for the people, the citizens, of the Lithuanian SSR, to travel abroad, because we do not have our own diplomatic service, we do not have such a status for the republic abroad. Therefore, we have to use the advantages of citizenship of the USSR." Brazauskas points out that this is particularly important at present when many people from Lithuania travel not only to countries of the socialist bloc but to countries which are across the Atlantic Ocean.

"I think this is one of the most difficult issues," Brazauskas says, "We should not rush to make amendements to the Constitution of the USSR but should concentrate with full seriousness on solving the question of our citizenship. I am not a lawyer but basic common sense prompts that the USSR Constitution should be amended by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. The next question of very great importance will be the question of the referendum."

Brazauskas mentions the discussion on amendments to Article 50 in the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR and says this issue is also very important. He says "Yes, we can remind our radio listeners that this article deals with freedom of conscience and relations between the church and the state, the church and school. A very serious commission which included members of the clergy and laymen worked on the amendment. A new text of this article, Article 50, has been prepared by this commission. I believe there will be a considerable discussion on this question; it is a very important issue for all the people of Lithuania, and it is also important to the Communist Party of Lithuania because we have expressed our opinion on these pressing issues of the freedom of conscience in the statute of the Communist Party of Lithuania."

Rupeika then asks Brazauskas about the relation between Lithuanian state property and that of the USSR. Brazauskas replies: "Of course we can adopt a decision on this here, but, the main work is waiting for us in Moscow. There in Moscow such a law should be adopted which would ensure the ownership of property by the republics."

Rupeika asks: "Well, you know, if that is so, then it is so. If not, then it will be different."

Rupeika says: "But this would mean that either we get into a deadlock or the gates will open."

Brazauskas responds: "Oh, no. When we want to achieve something very quickly, we immediately think there will be a deadlock. There must be a way out of such a situation. This week, we deputies from the Baltic republics signed a statement addressed to Comrade Gorbachev, chairman of the Supreme Soviet."

Brazauskas continues: "In the statment we made a concrete and clear proposal that this draft law should be discussed very attentively while taking into account the opinion of the majority of the republics, because the second variant claims USSR property or union and republican ownership of property. There are various formulations of the idea. However, this does not satisfy us if we have in mind what we want to achieve, which is our economic independence."

Rupeika then says: "The idea of duel ownership of property is nothing but a shield, it seems to me." Brazauskas responds: "I do not think there is any conscious shielding of some kind. I think this is an inability to change orientation."

Brazauskas then speaks about other laws to be passed before the republic can begin working in the conditions of economic independecce. He says: "We should not look at economic independence in a simplistic way. We must not think that introducing economic sovereignty in Lithuania is the same as switching on a light in a room by pressing a button. This is not so; This is a very complex process and it involves a large range of activities."

He goes on to speak about these activities in greater detail, mentioning inflation and banking, industries, and so on. He also speaks about the introduction of a republican currency and the difficulties which would occur during the transition period.

He notes that at the moment there is no legal basis to implement all these ideas. Many other actions could be carried out which will reduce inflation.

Benas Rupeika then remarks that surprisingly few people are standing outside the Supreme Soviet building today. Brazauskas comments: "We are aware of the people's mood without reading their plackards. These young people who are outside today, I believe they are mainly students. They are raising very urgent questions today. These questions are about compulsory military service, relations with the Soviet Armed Forces, young people being recruited for military service. I think people have read the report by Comrade Sakalauskas in the newspaper TIESA and in other papers about his talks with Comrade Yazov. He also spoke on television about what was decided during these talks. Indeed, we have signed several documents with Comrade Sakalauskas concerning all these pressing problems of our young people.

"Well, the first steps are not all that bad; they make the situation easier. It is very positive that the idea that Lithuanian young men should serve together in bigger groups was supported by the minister." He says these bigger groups of Lithuanian young men in a military unit will give them a possibility to defend themselves against any discrimination and bullying. Brazauskas says, that everything within the competence of the republican administration and of the Supreme Soviet has been done concerning this issue. Now only diplomacy and persistence on the part of the leading officials of the republic and the public can yield positive results on the matter.

Rupeika then asks: "Many people wanted me to ask you the following. Did you invite Mikhail Gorbachev to come to the 20th congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party? Did you have a chance to see him?" Brazauskas replies: "No, I did not have a chance to see Comrade Gorbachev. However, there is still time. Next week I will have to go again to the Supreme Soviet and I think such an opportunity will arise."

Benas Rupeika says many deputies were absent today because they often have to pay visits abroad, and he asks if the first secretary is allowed to go abroad. Brazauskas says: "We have the right but we have no time. There are invitations. This month I am planing to visit West Germany for 2 days and Switzerland; a university there has invited me to deliver some lectures."

Rupeika says: "We have not heard of invitations to party leaders, except for Boris Yeltsin." Brazauskas says: "Well, boris Yeltsin delivered lectures in the United States. I would say he delivered rather memorable lectures, and he still remembers them. My mission is rather more modest. I was invited by a school of higher education, (Somgalin higher school) to deliver some lectures for their special political seminar."

After touching on some issues of minor importance the interview concludes.

Brazauskas' Concluding Speech at Plenum

90UN0221B Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 18 Oct 89 pp 1, 3

[Concluding speech of Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Communist Party of Lithuania Central Committee, at the Comminist Party of Lithuania Central Commmittee's 21st Plenum]

[Text] Dear plenum participants! I would like in conclusion of our work to say a few words on the issues which we have been discussing for 2 days now. This plenum of ours is exceptionally crucial and really special, and people want to know our opinion and will read our speeches in the press, and this is good. Many people know what the headquarters of the Communist Party of Lithuania [CPL] is thinking, what its mood is and how opinions differ.

What are our priority goals, for what must we strive at our upcoming congress?

Primarily a broadening of democracy in all walks of life: in the running of the state, in the relations of political forces, in public life and in all other fields. We aspire to the creation of a democratic society in which each citizen feels himself to be an equal member thereof and an individual and participate democratically in deciding on all business of the people and the state and its destiny. We support the concept of freedom of belief, which is recorded in our draft documents. I believe that the debate on Article 50 of the Constitution will continue at the upcoming session, and we deputies will be able to affirm a modern approach, I would say, to the freedom of belief of all members of our society.

Second, the revival of Lithuania's statehood. This is a question which we began to study more than a year ago. We have done much, achieved much, and I have no wish today to enumerate here, each of you has witnessed or participated in the adoption at this forum or the other of historical decisions of such importance and so necessary for all of us. However, there still lies ahead of us a long road in the sphere of the assertion of statehood. Together with the slogan, which we proclaimed quite a long time ago, "Lithuania Without Sovereignty Is a Lithuania Without a Future"—this was a very bold slogan at the time, but today it already sounds a commonplace—there arose a new concept, that of Lithuania's independence. Many people understand it variously. We have spoken and argued about this many times, but, one way or another, it means the assertion of Lithuania's statehood. We have begun this path, and I am sure that we will continue it and achieve substantial, significant results. To take just economic independence, about which we have had much to say and which has today come to a standstill. I would like both our USSR Supreme Soviet members and all economists of Lithuania working here, in the rear, I would say, to act more intensively to ensure the speedier solution of this question.

Another question is the independence of the CPL. I believe that there is not in this hall a single person who does not believe that the independence of the CPL should really be legalized, and legalized at the upcoming congress. No one has taken issue with this. There were certain nuances, I would say, in the debate on this important matter. I would, generally, like to link this question with the CPL's role at the present stage of our life.

Yes, we are being criticized for not having done this or that, for having ruined the economy, for having allowed the cart of our economy to become bogged down in the mire and for the fact that now, it is said, the communists wish to slip the bridle and run away and yoke up some others. We are running nowhere, of course, and would not today find others who could be harnessed up. I, for example, see no other such political force in Lithuania, although I respect all who express their thoughts and who have their platfrom and their own opinion. Let us be realists—who, what alternative force or forces could today pull this cart? This can be done, I believe, only by the CPL and the communists here present—members of the government, the majority of whom are members of the Central Committee, the entire party aktiv and, finally, each communist.

This is one part of our activity. There is another also—our relations with the center.

No one asked either yesterday or today: What freedom of action do the Central Committee, the Bureau, the Secretariat have currently? Therefore I wish to say as first secretary that currently, and not only currently, we have progressively in recent years been increasingly aware of our possibilities. And real possibilities, I would say. There is no longer today the style which existed for a long time and which we are rightly criticizing and the center's former relations with the republics, specifically with the Central Committee, the CPL and the Secretariat, that daily tutelage and decisions which were adopted, without consultation and concordance, and which were standardized for all the republics, for the entire immense state. I gave much thought to whether I could from this platform say in what matters or in which spheres of activity the CPSU Central Committee hampers us. And, you know, I found virtually no area of work in which we are really prevented from operating normally. Who is preventing us legalizing a national school in Lithuania, who is preventing us deciding national questions? Who is dictating to us, who is preventing us preparing for transition to a system of economic independence? No one. But this old, cliched notion that it is necessarily the center, a powerful center, which is holding everything back and keeping a tight grip—this notion is still tenacious and will not, most likely, be removed by my speech from this platform. However, I declare with a full sense of responsibility that in our practical activity—I speak not from the legal but from the practical viewpoint—that we perceive no interference today. For this reason I wish to say that the question of legalizing this party independence is ripe. We must do this. Must determine the status of the CPL and relations with the CPSU. After all, we all acknowledge that the CPL should be represented in the governing elective bodies in the center and we all support ideological unity and oppose organizational limitations and subordination. All this must be recorded in our documents, on which we are working. There are draft versions, they are not entirely successful, possibly, we are late, nor has there been any practical experience—the CPL has never had its own rules, this is immense new work, and it needs to be done very seriously and with a great sense of responsibility. I am uniting all forces for us, all intellectual forces, which participated so actively in the preparation of both versions, there is, possibly, a third and a fourth version—excellent, very good—I really thank everyone for the fact that a large group of people has joined so vigorously and benevolently in this work. I believe that we will continue to creatively nurture these ideas and arrive at the congress with draft documents which reflect reality, reflect our wishes.

Speaking of our independence, we cannot forget either—and it is a very good thing that this was brought up in the debate—the perestroyka processes which are occurring in the center. One way or another, we are today an integral part of the CPSU, and it must be remembered that these processes and the perestroyka in the CPSU are going forward continually. Many people are speaking about the formation of a Russian Communist Party. These questions were raised also at the recent September Plenum, and were raised particularly pointedly at the drafting commission session. The question arises, of course: What will the status of the Communist Party of an individual republic be? I have already heard from more than one senior official, from leaders of the CPSU, that the documents which are to be published in the spring—the draft rules and program—will be very radical. If, and let us hope they are, if they are really so radical, might they, possibly, satisfy all the republic communist parties? So, we are taking a difficult, untrodden path, and processes are occurring alongside us also which we must remember and evaluate.

It is sometimes asked: Are you for a united CPSU or against? And I have to answer unambiguously, as if at confession. But, you know, life is life. Politics cannot be only black or white. In politics, as in war, there is room for maneuver, there has to be, but we forget this at times. It should not be forgotten that the transition to independence also could have various hues—dark, bright gray, off-white, completely white. We need to understand this creatively and not accuse one another. Not to pose the question thus: Are you with the CPSU or without the CPSU? Let us seek a formula which matches the actual stage of perestroyka. Today such a formula is appropriate, in March, possibly, it will be another, in a year, a third, perhaps, which does not even occur to us today. We need to remove the causes of confrontation and the division of the party, none of us wants this; we must preserve the political strength which is necessary today.

Yesterday Vitautas Sakalauskas spoke, and I subscribe to the fact that we—both the Communist Party and the government of the republic, everyone—must unite our forces in order to have an opportunity to tackle if only the paramount issues and plug the holes in the economy, if only the paramount ones. We can do this ourselves. We need to find a distribution mechanism which ensures that each citizen of ours enjoy opportunities, if only slight, real, nonetheless, to satisfy his requirements. This mechanism depends on us, no one from Moscow will come and help us do it. Kyastutis Glavyatskas spoke about this here also. We need to adopt such a program as quickly as possible and make use of all that is in our hands, and more even. We need to participate in this very actively. I believe that in adopting today the plenum decision to convene a party congress we are also adumbrating the need for the preparation of these priority documents. I propose the elaboration of a priority action program and that we start from today's preoccupations.

I would now like to return to the questions about which I spoke yesterday and which were discussed both yesterday and today—about the CPL Congress. We will obviously convene the congress this year, this is the revealed opinion.

The debate on the rules of representation is devoid of a basis in principle, I believe, so let us agree not to criticize one another over this. I can in no way agree with those who, speaking here, have said that fewer delegates is undemocratic, that some people's wishes could be imposed and that the candidates for delegate have been dictated from the center. Let us take a look, dear comrades, the draft resolution records the form in which delegates are elected locally. No centralism will be manifested here. The same mechanism operates whether there are 4,000 or 1,000 delegates. Absolutely the same. I warmly support people's sentiments in support of as active and as broad participation as possible, but one out of 200 or out of 50, all 200,000 communists cannot, for all that, participate in this historic congress.

It has been proposed here that forums in the cities be held. Is there a need for this?

I believe that the members of the Bureau also and the secretaries and, yes, the aktiv of the Central Committee, everyone must work properly these 2 months. It is necessary to visit the party organizations, meet with the communists and listen to people, even if they just want to sound off. After all, 100 persons, maybe 80, will, for all that, be able to speak at the congress—whether there are 4,000 or 1,000 delegates. Any more would be physically impossible. For this reason we all need to listen to people. I would like to see all gorkom and raykom secretaries also working not only at plenums and with committee members but really in the primary party organizations. Both in town and country. I understand the problems of the Vilnius party organization. All our artistic unions, Lithuania's entire main intellectual potential are here. I do not in any way wish to offend Kaunas or other cities but the preponderance of Lithuania's intellect is here. They, the communists, have been very active recently. This is notable and praiseworthy. We must obviously in these 2 months find opportunities for meeting more extensively with these communists and the party organizations and talking, discussing and ascertaining properly. There are many forms of our extensive communication.

We are being accused of visiting the party organizations infrequently. And rightly so. I have long had such work as necessitates dealings with Moscow, but I have not had to visit Moscow as many times as I have this year. Every week, virtually. Like it or not, I have been obliged to participate in such activity recently. And many in the leadership have had to do the same. Perhaps because the year has been so complex, it will be easier subsequently, perhaps. When we legalize economic independence, we will decide many questions ourselves, and this will ease our travel load. But this is not an excuse, merely a statement of fact. Of course, members of our Bureau also must participate more assertively in the solution of the problems troubling people and the examination of day-to-day questions which arise.

I would like in conclusion to wish that we all and myself be at the stage of preparation of the congress united, very fit for work and very creative and that in this brief 2-month period prior to the congress we prepare for it to the maximum extent. I once again thank the entire aktiv and the active members of our commission and those who are not members of the commission who prepared the documents.

It has been proposed that a congress preparation committee be formed. We must as of tomorrow involve ourselves in earnest with the questions connected with preparation for the congress.

Lithuanian, USSR Writers Unions Sign Accord

LD0811103689 Vilnius in English to North American 2300 GMT 6 Nov 89

[Text] The Writers' Unions of Lithuania and the Soviet Union have signed a cooperation agreement in Moscow. Let me remind you that this summer the Lithuanian Writers' Union proclaimed itself a self-dependent organization and since [as heard] now on the relations between the two unions will be based on agreements only. The first agreement signed, up to 1st January 1991, envisages joint sponsorship of literary functions and joint marking of certain literary anniversaries.

An agreement has been also reached on expanding book publication. The two unions will hold joint events abroad, international writers' meetings in Lithuania and in other union republics. The Lithuanian Writers' Union has become the first creative organization in Lithuania to have not only adopted its own regulations, proclaiming its self-dependence, but to have been also acknowledged by an agreement with an all-union organization.

Lithuanian Citizenship Law Outlined

PM0711150089 Moscow TRUD in Russian 7 Nov 89 p 3

[Own correspondent G. Konchyus report: "Lithuania: Law on Citizenship"]

[Text] The Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet session has finished work in Vilnius, having adopted after a long debate laws on citizenship and referendums and a number of other documents.

Virtually all those who now live in Lithuanian territory can become citizens of the republic. To do so it is necessary to make a statement acknowledging Lithuania to be their homeland...

Different rules have been set for future immigrants. In order to receive citizenship they must live in Lithuania for at least 10 years, master the Lithuanian language, and study the culture and customs of the local population. Anyone wishing to receive citizenship must swear an oath of loyalty to the republic. And he cannot remain a citizen of another state, that is, another union republic.

The new law makes provision for the receipt of passports as citizens of the Lithuanian SSR. But until the restoration of full state sovereignty a USSR passport will also be valid.

All-Union Komsomol on Lithuanian League's Split

PM0211123989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Nov 89 p 1

["All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League Central Committee 9th Plenum Resolution on 22d Lithuanian Leninist Communist Youth League Congress"]

[Text] After hearing and discussing the information report and conclusions of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol] commission charged with studying the problems that arose in connection with decisions taken by the 22d Lithuanian Leninist Communist Youth League Congress, the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee 9th Plenum resolves:

1. To take note of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee commission's conclusions.

2. To note that the decisions of the 22d Lithuanian Leninist Communist Youth League Congress are at variance with the existing statutory norms.

3. In the light of the history of relations between the All-Union Komsomol and the Lithuanian Leninist Communist Youth League, and on the basis of an analysis of the documents of party and Komsomol organs, to deem groundless the 22d Lithuanian Leninist Communist Youth League Congress demands that the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Bureau Resolution "Questions of the Komsomol Organizations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia" of 18 October 1940 be recognized as unlawful and invalid.

4. To register that a new youth organization which does not form part of the All-Union Komsomol—the Lithuanian Communist Youth League—has been created as a result of the 22d Lithuanian Leninist Communist Youth League Congress decisions.

To instruct the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Bureau to take the requisite steps to ensure that during reregistration All-Union Komsomol members who so wish have the opportunity to retain their statutory ties with the All-Union Komsomol and the organizations of the Lithuanian Leninist Communist Youth League.

To deem All-Union Komsomol members who have switched to membership of the Lithuanian Communist Youth League after reregistration as having left the All-Union Komsomol. To take from the Lithuanian Communist Youth League in accordance with established procedure All-Union Komsomol banners, stamps, books of blank Komsomol membership cards, badges, and other All-Union Komsomol paraphernalia.

To resolve the question of property in the possession of the Lithuanian Leninist Communist Youth League and material and financial resources in the light of the interests of Lithuanian Leninist Communist Youth League and Lithuanian Communist Youth League organizations. To set up a special commison to that end and to propose to the Lithuanian Communist Youth League Central Committee that it participate in its work.

To agree to the Lithuanian Communist Youth League Central Committee proposal that for the period of reregistration All-Union Komsomol members be afforded the opportunity to work in Lithuanian Communist Youth League organizations, and Lithuanian Communist Youth League members in Lithuanian Leninist Communist Youth League organizations.

5. To note that the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Bureau, while aware of the situation in the republic Komsomol organization, displayed dilatoriness and failed to take the necessary exhaustive measures.

6. Before 15 December 1989 to examine at the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Bureau, with the participation of the commission created, the proposals of All-Union Komsomol Central Committee departments and subunits agreed with the Lithuanian Communist Youth League Central Committee on collaboration and cooperation with the Lithuanian Communist Youth League for the period up to the 21st All-Union Komsomol Congress.

The All-Union Komsomol Central Committee proposes to the Lithuanian Communist Youth League Central Committee that specific measures be taken: To create conditions for joint work by members of Lithuanian Communist Youth League and Lithuanian Leninist Communist Youth League organizations at the level of primary, rayon, and city Komsomol organizations without setting them against one another; to seek ways to bring the interests of young people closer together and to consolidate young people on the basis of the ideas of perestroyka; and to prevent any demarcation on national grounds.

Vilnius Radio 'Pursuing Own Policy'

LD3010191189 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 28 Oct 89

[From the "Events and Views" program]

[Excerpts] Hello, I'm Vladas Dobilas. In this edition of "Events and Views" we shall talk about Radio Moscow Foreign Service. The fact is that Radio Moscow Foreign Service is celebrating its 60th anniversary this weekend, and I think it's a good opportunity to take a look at the work of one of the world's biggest broadcasting centers, even more so that Radio Moscow and Radio Vilnius are naturally linked with a number of ties. [passage omitted]

Well, it would be proper to turn to someone who is an outsider but belongs to Radio Moscow. I made a phone call to Moscow and got Mr Armen Oganesyan on the line. He's the head of the English Language Services of Radio Moscow broadcasting to the United States, Great Britain, and the World Service of Radio Moscow. So how does Armen Oganesyan see the key principles by which Radio Moscow goes? Unfortunately, the line was rather poor and we'll have to read from the studio what Armen Oganesyan said.

[Oganesyan recording in English heard in background] I think the most difficult thing is to give an explicit idea of our principles right now, because they are in the stage of developing and changing. So I can only identify the tendency which now exists and is taking shape. We are becoming more informative and less [word indistinct), which we used to be decades ago. Actually, we were an active partner to our Western colleagues, to the BBC and VOA, taking part in the cold war. Now we are leaving stereotypes and we try to pursue our editorial policies in the direction of pluralism of opinion.

Lithuania is part of the Soviet Union, so Radio Moscow as an all-union broadcasting corporation naturally covers events that are under way here. How accurate is the coverage? Jeff Sallot.

[Sallot] I've heard some reports on Radio Moscow concerning events in Lithuania. I think frequently their reports reflect the biases of the central press. I think, you know, that TASS and PRAVDA and some of the other central press do not have a sympathetic view of political events in the Baltic Republics, and perhaps they don't know what's going out here well enough. They should spend more time doing research. And I find that with Radio Moscow it's the same difficulty. I think they depend perhaps too much on TASS for their information about the Baltics rather than having their own reporters coming to investigate for themselves.

[Dobilas] Armen Oganesyan, head of the Radio Moscow English-language services, firmly believes that foreign listeners get to know a true picture of what is going in the Baltics, and Lithuania in particular. As to Radio Moscow depending too much on TASS, he told me the following.

[Oganesyan recording in English heard in the background] That was true some 6, 5 years ago but not now. Our own correspondents are seeking information now and I would say they are competing with TASS correspondents. No, we're not based primarily on their information. Of course, we use their information taking into consideration the fact that they have correspondents all over the world. But in general what concerns events here in the Soviet Union we now base on our own information, interviews and telephone calls. So I think we're becoming more and more independent in our sources of information. And this is also a reflection of glasnost, I would say.

[Dobilas] I must admit that I personally haven't met many Radio Moscow correspondents here in Vilnius, but my colleagues tell me they do come once in a while. But what finds its way from Moscow to Vilnius daily is teleprint material in Russian and occasionally in English, very long news bulletins and not so long commentaries. They are recommended to be included in Radio Vilnius Foreign Service broadcasts. Similar routes link Moscow with nine other capitals of Union Republics which have foreign radio services. I asked Armen Oganesyan what he thought of these practices of the elder brother patronage.

[Oganesyan recording in English heard in background] I think, said Armen Oganesyan, that first of all that's a two-way road. I would say that we also receive some programs from Kiev, from the Baltic Republics. We use their radio program in English, putting them on the air. So they have an opportunity to express their comments, their opinion through the waves of Radio Moscow. And you're always welcome. But on the other hand, it's up to you in Vilnius to decide whether you consider that this or that news is updated or not. Actually, my editorial doesn't send anything to our headquarters in Lithuania. So it's up to you to decide and to pursue our own policies, said Armen Oganesyan.

[Dobilas] Perhaps really that was a bit rude of me to put this question to Armen Oganesyan. The signature that stands at the bottom of each teleprint message is certainly not his.

As to pursuing one's own policies, well, Radio Vilnius has already been doing this for at least a year now. We no longer use Moscow materials and they keep accumulating in the teleprint room, heaps of waste paper. So for today, Radio Vilnius was advised to broadcast a page-long item on NATO's nuclear deterrent policy, while tomorrow's menu ought to have included a commentary called "Criteria of Morality, the Touchstone of Soviet Foreign Policy." Well, I'm afraid you'll have to turn to

Radio Moscow if you got interested in these particular issues. Radio Vilnius meanwhile prefers to focus on other matters closer to what is going on here in Lithuania.

So the old-type relations between Radio Moscow and Radio Vilnius seem to have disintegrated and until we strike a new relationship of equal partners the most tangible expression of cooperation is transmitters in Moscow which beam Radio Vilnius English program worldwide.

Report on Gorbachev's Talks With Estonian Deputies

LD0811103189 Tallinn International Service in English 2130 GMT 6 Nov 89

[From the "Estonia Today" program]

[Text] Last Thursday [2 November] the Estonian deputies in Moscow had a chance to meet with Mikhail Gorbachev. The meeting lasted half an hour. The questions of the recent historical assessment of the events of 1939-1940 was discussed. Gorbachev said that he wasn't sure whether the whole of the Soviet Union would share our point of view about those events. It could evoke protests that he, meaning Gorbachev, would not be able to (?contain) any more. Gorbachev said he was afraid of a re-evaluation [words indistinct]. The Estonian deputies explained that it was not a question of seceding from the USSR: it's a question of an honest and correct historic assessment, which is unavoidable if we want to restore the people's trust in their leaders.

We have also received information that Mikhail Gorbachev called Vaino Valjas [words indistinct] Estonia's Parliament [words indistinct] decision on its assessment of the events in 1940. The draft resolution declares that the decision of the Estonian Parliament in 1940 to join [the USSR] continued to be legally invalid. Mikhail Gorbachev's only comment on the phone call was: (?yes, we have talked). His stand can be expressed in the following way: You can achieve everything while moving slowly, but if you are going to take too long [words indistinct].

But if our leadership drops the above mentioned resolution from the agenda, Estonian leaders could lose their [words indistinct] and at the next elections even the leadership of the popular front [words indistinct]. So we must wait for the next parliamentary session, which will start in Tallinn on 10 November.

Residence Qualifications Focus in Estonian Election

PM0611170789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Nov 89 First Edition p 6

[Report by Captain Third Rank V. Urban, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent: "In the Struggle of Opinions. Preparations Under Way in Estonia for Elections to Local Organs of Power"]

[Text] Tallinn, 3 Nov—There have been no surprises. The current election campaign has merely intensified the feeling that has been running high here since summer. At first, the republic draft Law on Elections to Local Soviets of People's Deputies was strongly criticized by a number of social organizations representing the nonindigenous population for the residential qualification it introduced. Then the law itself became one of the causes of the August strikes by Russian-speaking labor collectives.

As is well known, a number of articles in this law have been seen by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to be at variance with the USSR Constitution and international legal acts. But the October session of the republic's parliament abolished only the residential qualification for voters, and even that was with the proviso that it would be a temporary measure extending only to the 10 December elections. The restrictions have remained in place for candidate deputies.

Consequently, in the opinion of the republic strike committee, the workers' demands have not been met. M. Lysenko, committee chairman, recently made another appeal to boycott these elections and hold alternate ones.

The already serious conflict has been made still worse by the election platform proposed by the People's Front. In it, the Estonian People's Front proclaims a gradual transition by parliamentary means from the status of a sovereign republic within the framework of the USSR to a state independent of the USSR.

What lies behind this? "The Masks Removed"—this was the title of a commentary in the latest issue of the newspaper MOLODEZH ESTONII, and I believe it eloquently reflects the essence of what is happening. It is certainly true that, in its platform, the Estonian People's Front indicates with enviable frankness that so far its leaders have used the restructuring begun by the party as a screen. Now, however, the true aims of the movement are openly stated for the first time.

Incidentally, the residential qualification is interpreted by its supporters as "level of competence." But it is now clear that it has a quite definite political slant, because it is primarily the Russian-speaking population that is deprived of the possibility of running for election. That is the opinion of G. Aleshin, second secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, for example. His speech at a visiting session of the Baltic Military District Military Council in Tallinn 1 November once again confirmed the complexity of the situation in the republic.

The Military District Military Council session, to which A. Ryuytel, chairman of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, commanders, and leading political workers from Tallinn Garrison units were also invited, discussed questions connected with preparation for the elections. The fact is that many servicemen do not agree with the new law, which provides for the nomination of only one deputy to the city soviet by voters from the capital's garrison. The nomination of candidates from the units to village and settlement soviets is not envisaged at all. This information comes from a report by Lieutenant General O. Zinchenko, member of the Military Council and chief of the Baltic Military District Political Directorate.

True, both A. Ryuytel and G. Aleshin described the election of deputies from the units as a compromise solution and the only right solution in the present situation. At the Military Council session, Colonel General F. Kuzmin, military district commander and USSR people's deputy, proposed that those present speak out frankly on these problems, and, in their speeches, officers expressed their disagreement with the stand taken by the republic leadership and talked about the infringement of servicemen's civil rights.

Social questions were also touched on. For example, in one of the units only 10 percent of officers and warrant officers have been provided with apartments. But the city itself is allocating virtually no housing, and the situation is hardly likely to change in the near future. This means that problems soon to be encountered by deputies wearing shoulder straps have already begun to take shape.

The registration of candidate deputies began today. Five candidates have been nominated from the "military" electoral okrug.

A meeting took place 1 November between Col Gen F. Kuzmin, commander of the Baltic Military District, and V. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee.

Baltic Meeting on Economic Coordination

90UN0230A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 21 Oct 89 pp 1, 3

[ELTA Report: "Baltic Republics Coordinate Their Activity"]

[Text] A meeting was held recently in Riga of government delegations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. Our republic was represented thereat by Vitautas Sakalauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, Vitautas Sharka, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee], Kazimera Prunskene, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers, Romualdas Sikorskis, minister of finance of the Lithuanian SSR, and Pranas Mazheyka, first deputy chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply].

The meeting adopted minutes in which it was resolved to discuss in the Baltic republic supreme soviets and evaluate the USSR bill "Property in the USSR," particularly Articles 23, 24 and 25, approve for a second reading in the USSR Supreme Soviet the bill "The Economic Independence of the Lithuanian SSR, Latvian SSR and Estonian SSR" in the 19 October version agreed among the three republics and step up promotion of the bill for final discussion and adoption. In the opinion of the participants in the meeting, it would be expedient for the leaders of the working groups preparing the draft laws of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia to coordinate the basic provisions and principles of these drafts. For the purpose of protecting the home market and curbing inflation it is planned in the first half of November 1989 coordinating the Baltic republics' actions with respect to the introduction in 1990 of certificates (checks) with the subsequent transition to republic currencies. It is also planned in the first half of November 1989 holding in Tallinn a meeting of an intergovernmental commission on the further development of the Baltic republics' economic integration and the creation of a common market.

Before 1 December of this year the Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian Gosplans [state planning committees] and Gossnabs [state committees for material and technical supply] will have exchanged information on the industrial-engineering products manufactured in the republics for the purpose of the development of interrepublic exchange and the rationalization of supplies and also on imports of raw material, intermediate products, semimanufactures, machinery and equipment purchased annually for the republics' economy for the purpose of the elaboration of joint measures to reduce dependence on imports and save foreign currency and organize joint ventures with other states. Prior to 1 November of this year the Gosplans of the Baltic republics are also to have prepared common principles of currency relations between the republics and the USSR central authorities.

The minutes of the meeting observe that for the purpose of coordination of the work on the republics' transition to economic independence (economic accountability) it is necessary that the administrators of the Baltic republic councils of ministers examine within a month the question of the opening of permanent offices in Vilnius, Riga and Tallinn. An approbatory attitude should be adopted toward the proposal concerning the opening of joint offices both in foreign countries and in a number of regions of the USSR.

The minutes of the meeting of the delegations were signed by K. Prunskene, M. Raman and E. Savisaar, deputy chairmen of the Baltic republic councils of ministers.

Roundtable Held on Local Self-Government

90UN0226A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 44, 4-10 Nov 89 p 4

[Report by V. Voronetskiy: "What Is Local Self-Government To Be Like?"]

[Text] This issue, which at present concerns many people, became the subject of an in-depth roundtable discussion at the editorial office of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. Taking part in the discussion were the subcommittee chairman of the Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet for Issues of Operation of the Soviets of

People's Deputies, Development of Government, and Self-Government, N. Travkin; the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Baumanskiy Rayon Soviet in Moscow, N. Gonchar; representatives of the microrayons of the capital city, and scientists.

Opening the meeting, N. Gonchar said: "At present, there are more than 50,000 local soviets in our country. This is the element of the government system which is the closest to the people. The confidence the people have in the authorities depends to a great extent on how the local soviets operate. The time has now come to consider whether the present-day local soviets conform to the originally formulated sense of their operations. It is clear that the soviets are lacking the main point—continuous (rather than on the occasion of elections) mass participation by the populace in their activities. The development of self-government is the only way to restore the concept snuffed out by the command-administrative system. Committees and councils of social self-government are being vigorously created in many cities, including Moscow, on the initiative of residents of microrayons. Meanwhile, to this day these organs are out of status. The draft new Law on Local Self-Government and Local Economy also mentions them in passing."

Having familiarized those assembled with this document, People's Deputy N. Travkin agreed that the article of the law on the organs of territorial social self-government should be expanded. Moreover, councils of labor collectives also need to be acknowledged to be the organs of soviet power because in the current environment of economic accountability enterprises will not allow local soviets to be the masters of their territory.

Candidate of Philosophical Sciences G. Zulumyan recalled that the idea of territorial social self-government has long been implemented in other countries whose experience needs to be put to use. After all, in our country self-government is only budding. People want to personally take part in organizing their life. Their initiative needs to be supported in every way possible. The issue of the status of self-government organs is also very important. There is still no clear determination of whether these are the lowest elements of local soviets with their micro-executive committees or social organizations. Under the current conditions, the law should offer extensive opportunities to the committees of social self-government as an echelon which provides feedback from the populace to the rayon authorities.

S. Popov, chairman of the self-government council of the MZhK [expansion unknown] "Saburovo," voiced a different opinion. In this microrayon, a concept of creative self-government is being implemented whose essence is extremely simple: All local issues are resolved through the efforts of the inhabitants themselves and the use of local resources. The council of self-government provides current supervision and organization of activities. A conference of residents at which the council is elected maps out the strategy of socioeconomic development. The provision of all facilities and landscaping of the microrayon are carried out here on the basis of local resources. Production-research and creative arts associations, a research and production cooperative, a scientific-technical center, and a number of workshops and studios operate within the system of self-government. A cable TV center regularly airs its own programs. The MZhK "Saburovo" is one of the founding shareholders of a commercial innovations bank. About 200 people are employed by the self-government in full-time positions alone. Financial and material resources worth hundreds of thousands of rubles are involved in its operations.

Under these conditions, the self-government council of the MZhK "Saburovo" needs the sociopolitical status of at least a settlement soviet of people's deputies. The property of the self-government organs needs to be codified; conditions for performing regular financial and economic activities need to be ensured. Self-government organs should be given an opportunity to create their own economically accountable enterprises and organizations.

Procedures for the interaction of the self-government organs with superior organs of government should be established, including a mechanism for delegating rights and responsibilities and detailing the levels of joint and independent responsibilities.

V. Zapolskiy said: "Our 'North Golyanovo' committee, which was set up on the initiative of the residents, has done much work aimed at preparing a draft of comprehensive development of the microrayon. The first step has already been taken. A Moscow Soviet resolution adopted on our initiative envisages the construction of a school, a policlinic for children, an athletic and health-maintenance facility with a pool, a bath and treatment complex, a service combine, and an educational and cultural center for children and teenagers; we have found locations for building parking lots. The construction of all of that is planned for 1991-1993. It will largely depend on the new set of deputies when these facilities are going to appear in our territory and what their quality is going to be. It is understandable that funds are also needed in order to implement the program accepted by the residents."

Research associate of the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences A. Bondarenko believes that in the environment of economic accountability and self-financing of enterprises conflicts between producers and consumers are unavoidable. The duty of the local self-management organs is to extinguish such contradictions in a timely manner, reconcile the interests of the population and of labor collectives, and document contractual relations.

In the course of the discussion, an argument ensued about who is to endow the self-government organs with these extensive rights. A majority agreed that this should be laid down in the law. A member of the coordination council of the committee of social self-government of the Brateyevo microrayon, S. Druganov; the chairman of the committee of self-government of the Arbat microrayon, L. Burkina; and many others referred to this.

In their opinion, a territorial community of people should have its property. These are cultural and athletic facilities and communal economy enterprises. Their profits should replenish the budgets of self-government committees. Other enterprises situated in the territory of the microrayon must contribute a certain segment of their profits to the budget.

A member of the coordination council of the self-government committees of Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon, V. Kukin, said: "If the rights of the organs of self-government are going to be determined by the rayon soviet, we will lose even what we have achieved. Some will get the rights and others won't."

The participants in the round table noted that the draft law says almost nothing about the responsibility of local organs of power to the citizens. The right of any citizen residing in the territory of a particular soviet to seek justice through the people's court in case his rights are violated needs to be ensured.

Their own homegrown bureaucracy might appear in the self-government organs. The main antidote is in the profound democratization of the entire system of management at all levels, expansion of glasnost, and extensive use of the instruments of direct democracy.

Bromley Further Defines Federation Concept

90US0153A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 21 Oct 89 p 3

[Article for NOVOSTI by Academician Yu. Bromley, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Ethnography Institute: "Not a Return to Confederation But Development of the Federation"]

[Text] Without a strong Union, there are no strong republics, without strong republics, there is no strong Union—such is the pivotal idea of Soviet federalism predetermining its present renewal and further development. This idea was reflected in the CPSU platform "The Party's Nationality Policy Under Current Conditions" adopted at the CPSU Central Committee September Plenum.

The final wording of the document is the fruit not simply of collective but truly mass work, in which millions participated. The draft of the platform was published for nationwide discussion, and it went through in an atmosphere of high assertiveness and, I would add, an acutely critical approach.

I have often written articles in the debate on the nationality issue which has developed in the Soviet press. It is gratifying to recognize that thoughts which I have expressed (although, understandably, far from all) helped in the formulation and honing of the CPSU platform. Its propositions now appear entirely natural, yet some of them were even recently having to be defendedly stubbornly at times in a difficult struggle of opinions.

Thus PRAVDA for 12 July carried in the "Contribution to the Upcoming CPSU Central Committee Plenum" column the article "Federal Union." The authors, N. Mikhaleva and Sh. Panidze, explained: The conversion of the Soviet Union from a strong federation to a fragile confederation would be a step backward. Their position was disputed in PRAVDA (26 July) by R. Gudaytis and B. Genzyalis from Lithuania and I. Gryazin from Estonia. The latter referred to the strength of such a confederation as Switzerland.

I cannot help but join in a dialogue touching on cornerstones of the national-state arrangement of the USSR, which requires, of course, many changes, but progressive, and not regressive.

Truly, there are still countries in the world which are still called confederations. But they have all in fact long been typical federations. Their components (cantons, provinces and so forth), granted all their sovereignty and formally permissible claims to separation from the union state, are in practice deprived of the right to separation. It is self-evident: Nations' right to self-determination has by no means to culminate in the prospect of their alienation and dissociation. Trends toward the integration of peoples and countries, on the contrary, predominate in West Europe currently, for example.

"All of Soviet and world experience points to the need for self-determination to be seen not only as a unique act associated with exercise of the right to separation," the CPSU platform emphasizes. "This is a complex, multilevel process of the assertion of national dignity, a strengthening of political and economic independence and the development of language and culture."

Yes, the lessons of the past testify that the conversion of the USSR into a confederation would be a movement backward. Something of the kind emerged in the country at the time of the civil war, when treaty relations, which helped, of course, a unification of forces and resources in the struggle against counterrevolution, but which revealed increasingly their insufficiency and inefficiency, took shape between the young Soviet republics. Closer and stronger relations were required. They were established after the formation of the USSR in 1922. The single union state provided better for defense capability, socioeconomic progress within the framework of an integral economic complex and the free national development of the peoples on the basis of equality. Not simply an addition but multiplication of forces resulted.

Of course, granted all this, Soviet federalism cannot remain frozen in its initial features. But it does not need destructive innovations but constructive renewal and serious improvement in keeping with the tasks of perestroyka in the USSR. The basis of these changes is the CPSU platform.

There are many difficulties ahead. There arises, specifically, the question of refinement of the criteria of separation of the basic entities constituting the federation. After all, both the population and economic potential of some autonomous republics (Tataria, Bashkiria) are greater than in some union republics (Estonia, Latvia, Moldavia). And some oblasts (Moscow, Leningrad, Sverdlovsk) and krays (Krasnodar, Krasnoyarsk) are comparable in terms of the same parameters to whole regions (the Baltic, say). The status of basic federal entity, however, affords a number of advantages of an economic, political and cultural nature.

There is the following aspect of the problem also: The majority of present-day federal states consists of parts of relatively equal size—states, provinces, lands and so forth. Yet in the USSR Krasnoyarsk Kray alone is more vast than the Baltic, the Transcaucasus and Central Asia put together. This has to be taken into consideration in the theory and practice of the development of the Soviet federation.

And, further: The CPSU platform provides for the creation of such national-territorial formations as national areas and rural and community soviets. This is an important contribution to realization of the political equality of the peoples. But difficulties and contradictions may arise here also.

There are many such problems, and some of them are complex, but the CPSU platform is a dependable basis of their solution. I recall the precise reference point of the course charted at the time of active participation of the public at large: a strong Union means strong republics. Each of them acquires greater independence. Of course, there should be no aspiration to autarky here. Attempts to introduce one's own currency, settlement qualifications and migration law and to manufacture products only or chiefly of narrowly local, and not all-union, significance are dangerous symptoms of self-isolation. There is no doubt that the diktat of central departments is a manifest evil, but no better, if not worse, is an orgy of local bureaucracy, one's "own," what is more, belonging almost entirely to the nationality which has given the republic its name. We need to consider measures to prevent such distortions.

Concern for their international cohesion and the closer integration and strengthening of the USSR remains vitally important for all Soviet peoples.

USSR Ownership of Republic Land Questioned

90UN0182A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 15 Oct 89 pp 2-3

[Query by Estonian Supreme Soviet Deputy E. Pyldroos and response by Estonian Justice Minister A. Kiris]

[Text]

Query of E. Pyldroos, deputy of the Supreme Soviet of the ESSR [Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic], on the right of national ownership of our land, natural environment, and mineral wealth.

Dear Deputies!

I presented this query directly to the previous session. It states that at the USSR Supreme Soviet session (meaning the previous session), in connection with the discussion of problems of IME [Economically Accountable Estonia], discussion arose with regard to ownership of the union republics, to include Estonia. I request an explanation: Have any documents been accepted by Estonia on the basis of which our national right to ownership of our land, natural environment, and mineral wealth—acknowledged even by the Soviet Union on the basis of the Peace of Tartu—has been transferred to the Soviet Union? Is there any reason to believe that the 21 July Declaration has become the basis for transferring right of ownership? Is there any other justification to believe that the above-mentioned right of ownership has been terminated, and is there any judicial basis for possible claims by the Soviet Union to right of ownership of the Estonian SSR? Does the USSR Supreme Soviet have the competence to discuss the question of the national right of ownership of the Estonian SSR? Let me clarify somewhat: I do not direct my query toward interpretation of the 16 November resolutions, and I do not wish to receive another confirmation that these resolutions are effective and that doubts as to their efficacy are in vain. The question is: Prior to the 16 November resolutions, prior to our declaration of sovereignty, were there any events of judicial import that eliminated our right to ownership of our land, of our natural environment? Let me clarify here that I am not talking about right of ownership of one specific industrial enterprise or another, which could be transferred by some department beyond the borders of Estonia. I am talking about the wealth of our mineral resources, our land, our soil, our natural environment. Being aware (this could be related to my lack of competence) of not a single act or resolution concerning transfer of the right of ownership, I fear that perhaps we see here a usurpation of ownership.

Response of Estonian SSR Justice Minister A. Kiris to the query of Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Deputy E. Pyldroos.

Dear Deputies!

Insofar as the query of Deputy E. Pyldroos appears in the form of four questions, I shall attempt to respond to these specific questions.

First, the deputy has requested an explanation as to whether the Estonian SSR has accepted any documents on the basis of which our national right of ownership to the land, natural environment, and minerals (also acknowledged, in accordance with the Peace of Tartu, by the Soviet Union) has been transferred to the USSR.

I can state in response that the treaty of peace signed 2 February 1920 between the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and Estonia does, in fact, acknowledge Estonia's right of ownership to its own territory and other property. It is true that in addition to the land and water, this peace treaty does not make separate mention of other natural resources, including minerals, but it is clear from the treaty provisions that the RSFSR recognizes the right of ownership of Estonia to any property in the territory and waters of Estonia; hence this includes an acknowledgment for Estonia of its entire natural environment and all its wealth. It should be noted at the same time that not a single document has been accepted in the Estonian SSR according to which our national right of ownership of our own natural resources would have been ceded to the USSR.

Second, Deputy Pyldroos wished to know if there were any grounds to support the idea that the Declaration of 21 July 1940 might comprise a basis for the transfer of national right of ownership of Estonia to the USSR. I can affirm in response to this question that the Declaration on State Authority in Estonia, adopted 21 July 1940 by the State Duma, does not treat questions involving the right of ownership; it simply declares the establishment of Soviet power throughout Estonia.

Third, the deputy inquires as to whether there are any other reasons to believe that the above-mentioned right of ownership was terminated, and whether there is any judicial basis for possible USSR claims to right of ownership of the ESSR. I will state that this question is more complex and requires deeper analysis. The fact of the matter is that the declaration adopted 22 July 1940 by the State Duma on Estonia's entry into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics contained a request to the USSR Supreme Soviet to accept the Estonian SSR into the USSR as a union republic on the same grounds as the Ukrainian SSR, Belorussian SSR, and other union republics. The basis for entry of these union republics into the USSR is the Treaty on the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, concluded 30 December 1922, or Union Treaty, as it is usually called. Item "M" of Article 1 of this treaty provides that the establishment of basic principles of land-tenure regulation and land usage over the entire territory of the USSR, as well as the use of riches in the earth's depths, forests, and bodies of water, falls under the jurisdiction of the highest organs of the USSR. The analogous right has also been extended to the highest USSR state organs by all USSR constitutions in effect over various periods, in Article 14 of the 1939 USSR Constitution, for example, in effect at the time Estonia entered the USSR. Item 4 of Article 73 of the current (1977) USSR Constitution ascribes the establishment of legislative principles of the USSR and union republics to the jurisdiction of the highest USSR state organs, without enumerating the types of principles involved. Proceeding from this standard, however, all-union principles of legislation regarding the earth, forests, bodies of water, and mineral deposits have been established which regulate matters in extensive detail on the use of these natural resources in some areas.

Item 5 of Article 73 of the present USSR Constitution also relates the establishment of general measures for the efficient use and protection of natural resources to the jurisdiction of the highest USSR state organs. Proceeding from this standard, many other legal acts applying over the entire USSR in addition to legislative principles have been adopted—acts regulating the use of natural resources, beginning with the laws on protecting the atmosphere and wildlife and concluding with numerous resolutions of the USSR Government and departmental acts.

Insofar as, in accordance with generally accepted principles of civil law, the right of ownership—of the use and disposition of property—belongs only to the property owner, in the judicial sense the USSR organs of authority may in fact affirm, based on the Union Treaty and USSR Constitution, that through the establishment of procedural foundations for using natural resources, the USSR also exercises throughout the state the right of possession of natural resources, insofar as the union republics themselves have apparently, according to the Union Treaty and USSR Constitution, ceded this right to the central union authority.

In this regard, however, such a conclusion is possible only as a theoretical, indirect computation, since up until now USSR legislation is devoid of a direct legal act which would demarcate all-union and republic property. True, it is stipulated in Article 36 of the 1936 USSR Constitution and in still greater detail in Article 11 of the present (1977) Constitution that state property is the general possession of all the Soviet people and the land, depths of the earth, forests, and bodies of water are enumerated as being among the state's exclusive possessions. However, these documents do not precisely define the actual division of all the people's property between central state authority and the republics. For the Soviet people living in Estonia can decide practically nothing in the sphere of using the natural and other riches of, let us say, Russia, the Ukraine, and Central Asia. And conversely, the individual citizen or labor collective in Russia, the Ukraine, or other places does not, as a rule, decide matters involving the use of resources located in Estonia. Consequently, only the highest state organs of the USSR and union departments, in addition to the applicable republics, have had at their disposal—in the name of all the Soviet people—the natural resources located in the union republics. However, these organs often function without considering the genuine interests of the people, for they do not know local conditions. This leads to a strained ecological situation and results in other mistakes proceeding from the administrative-command system.

It is evident that Soviet legal and policy experts of the perestroyka period themselves felt the trouble issuing from the vagueness of the concept used up until now of all-people's property, and it is precisely for this reason that it was considered necessary at the CPSU Central Committee plenum on nationalities policy to adopt an all-union law on ownership in the very near future. At the same time, in the section of the CPSU platform on nationalities policy adopted 20 September of this year, dealing with questions of the Soviet federation, it was stipulated that the republics would adopt laws on the use of natural resources based on the principles of appropriate all-union legislation, proceeding from the fact that the land, depths of the earth, bodies of water, and other natural resources constitute the property of the union republic and the USSR, or union-republic joint property, so to speak.

Among the draft laws presented before the current session of the USSR Supreme Soviet is the USSR draft law on property, which also recommends that the ownership of natural resources be established as joint ownership of the union and union republics. This signals a clarification in this regard in the USSR Constitution of the present concept of exclusive state property. Consequently, it is proposed that the question of ownership of natural resources be resolved in the Supreme Soviet. Thus the USSR people's deputies elected from all union republics, and deputies representing the Estonian SSR, can materially influence the outcome of the resolution of this issue. The most important thing they should proceed from in this regard is the legislation of the Estonian SSR, especially recent legislative acts. It is true that, during the period 1940-1988, the question of ownership in Estonian SSR legislation was decided in the same vague manner as was seen in USSR legislation. This means that legal acts of the Estonian SSR, beginning as far back as the 23 July 1940 declaration of the State Duma, simply stipulated that all the land, with all the riches of its depths, all its forests, lakes and rivers, are declared the property of all the people, i.e., state property. Nowhere in this declaration, in the Estonian SSR constitutions of 1940 and 1978, in the land, water, or forest codes of the Estonian SSR, or in the Estonian SSR code on the earth's depths, has the concept of property of all the people (or all-people's property) been disclosed, [illegible] has there been a determination of the share of ownership of the Estonian SSR in the totality of USSR state property.

In 1988 as a consequence of the conflict involving Estonian phosphorites, it became critically apparent that there was a need to precisely determine the degree of ownership of natural resources authorized by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet in its 16 November 1988 constitutional corrections, establishing, as we know, that the land, earth's depths, internal and territorial waters, forests, and other natural resources are the exclusive property of the Estonian SSR. It is true that the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet declared these additions to our Constitution invalid on 26 November last year, but was legally incorrect in so doing. Since I already responded at the previous session of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet to deputy queries as to the legal force of our 16 November 1988 decisions, I will not repeat this here and now. I will note only that no one is competent to repeal acts of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet, as the highest organ of authority of a sovereign republic, except that organ itself. This is one of the manifestations of Estonian sovereignty. Additionally, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet already legally formulated its position on ownership of the republic in an act—in Part 1 of Article 15 of our 18 May 1989 law, "Foundations of Economic Accountability of the Estonian SSR," which also establishes that exclusive ownership by the Estonian SSR extends to the land, earth's depths, airspace over republic territory, internal and territorial waters, continental shelf, forests, and other natural wealth. This law is not disputed by a single one of the highest organs of USSR authority. On the contrary, it received a certain degree of approval from the USSR Supreme Soviet in its 27 July 1989 resolution on the proposals of the supreme soviets of the Lithuanian SSR, Latvian SSR, and Estonian SSR on the transition of these republics to economic accountability. As you know, it was prescribed in this resolution that USSR legislative acts which regulate economic relations are operative on our territory only insofar as they do not hinder our transition to economic accountability. Since the question of ownership is a key question of economic relations, the Estonian SSR may repudiate its laws on the republic's exclusive ownership of natural resources, and these standards should be protected by the people's deputies elected from the republic.

If all the same, in an all-union law on ownership, the USSR Supreme Soviet establishes union-republic joint ownership of natural wealth, it should follow that application of this standard is repudiated in the Estonian SSR, based on the above-mentioned 27 July 1989 resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet on economic accountability.

Fourth, Deputy Pyldroos asked whether the USSR Supreme Soviet is competent to discuss the question of national ownership of the Estonian SSR. According to Item 7 of Article 113 of the USSR Constitution, the USSR Supreme Soviet legislatively regulates property relations within USSR jurisdiction. In this regard, however, the very concept of USSR jurisdiction in our current stage, the stage of renewal of our federation, when guarantees of the sovereign rights of the union republics are being secured, comprises a changing concept. In this regard, the USSR people's deputies and the CPSU Central Committee plenum on nationalities policy emphasized that it was necessary to ensure sovereignty of the republics, i.e., the practically boundless jurisdiction of the USSR should be narrowed. There can be no sovereignty without the highest authority—including the right to be master of the natural resources located on one's own territory.

Consequently, the USSR Supreme Soviet could discuss the question of ownership of the union republics, but only with respect to demarcating the jurisdictional limits of central USSR authority and the union republics in this sphere. The USSR Supreme Soviet could make decisions on matters of ownership of a union republic only with a consensus of deputies elected from all the republics. Making decisions on the ownership of a republic without its consent is not permissible, for that would negate the republic's sovereignty, i.e., one of the basic provisions of the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of the union republics.

I should state in conclusion that the right of a union republic to its land, natural environment, and mineral resources must, without a doubt, be included among its sovereign rights. Today questions on the right of ownership, partly as a result of the initiative of our republic, arise in sharp debate in the USSR Supreme Soviet and in the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Elected deputies from our republic should play an active role and work to achieve adoption of the conceptual provisions developed in our republic. A final decision on this issue, however, can be rendered only by developing a mechanism for ensuring the sovereignty of the union republics during the course of achieving further reform in the political system of the USSR. To this end, as we know, the Supreme Soviet of our republic and the highest organs of other republics have undertaken highly energetic measures.

Oct Revolution Anniversary Marked in Azerbaijan

NC0911090189 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 8 Nov 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] In accordance with tradition, the October festivities began in Baku with a naval parade. The red bannered ships of the Caspian Fleet formed a line at the [word indistinct] point. The [word indistinct] was decorated with flags. The leaders of the Azerbaijan Communist Party and the members of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium and the republic's government attended the ceremony.

The fleet commander read a report and then the melody of the song Comrades, Forward With Courage was played. The republic's leaders took their place on [word indistinct] which passed in front of the warships, while the seamen stood (?proudly) on the decks of the ships. In reply to the congratulations extended to them on occasion of the day, they all chanted: Hurrah.

Lenin Square was converted into [word indistinct] center prior to the anniversary. Party, war, and work veterans, leading production workers from all the rayons in Azerbaijan, and scholars, men of letters, and artists excelling in fine arts, who were especially invited to the festivities, sat in the platforms. Vezirov, [name indistinct], Kafarova, Mamedov, Mutalibov, Orudzhev, Polyanichko, Popov, Rasi-Zade, Rustamov, Guseynov, and Alekperov and generals and admirals took their places in the central platform.

The [words indistinct] arrived at the square and received the report of the parade commander at 1000. After greeting the troops, he delivered a speech. The troops marched out of the square, followed by the mechanized units. Then the march of the workers in Baku began. Representatives of individual establishments and scientific and cultural centers, leading production workers, and veterans marched out of the square. More than 130,000 residents of Baku participated in the parade that day. They demonstrated once again that they are loyal to the ideas of October, values of socialism, and reconstruction work. Artillery fire illuminated the sky over Baku during the night.

The newspapers published lengthy reports about the military parade and on the festive display of the workers in Baku. They also published reports and photographs of the celebrations in Nakhichevan, Kirovabad, Shusha, Mingechaur, Ali-Bayramly, Sheki, and Agdam on the occasion of the October anniveersary.

Azeri Council of Ministers Deputy Chairman Chosen

NC0611090189 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 5 Nov 89

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] The newspapers today published the decision adopted by the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium on the appointment of [word indistinct] Ivanovich (Radayev) as deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers Presidium.

The biography of Comrade (Radayev) was added to the report.

Gang Arrested for Murder of Azerbaijani Plant Head

PM0811205189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
4 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 7

[TASS report: "At the USSR Prosecutor's Office. Criminal Group Exposed"]

[Text] Organs of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Prosecutor's Office, in cooperation with the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs, have cleared up the murder of F.Sh. Shiraliyev, director general of the "Bakpivo" Production Association, on 6 September in Apsheronskiy Rayon.

As a result of skillful organization, professional knowhow, and personal courage, a well established criminal gang of over 10 people was swiftly exposed.

It was established that Shiraliyev was killed by the criminals for the sum of R50,000. During the investigation it was also established that the criminals had carried out especially serious crimes over a long period of time—murder, robbery with violence, and thefts on the territory of the Azerbaijan SSR and in other parts of the country.

Edged weapons and firearms, including automatic firearms, were confiscated from the criminals.

All the members of the criminal gang have been arrested.

The criminal case is being investigated by the investigation section of the Azerbaijan SSR Prosecutor's Office. The progress of the investigation is being monitored by the USSR Prosecutor's Office.

Armenian National Movement Congress Concludes

PM0811091589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Sergey Bablumyan report: "Constituent Congress of the Armenian National Movement"]

[Text] Yerevan—The constituent congress of the Armenian National Movement (AOD) concluded its work in Yerevan.

The AOD's program was submitted for public discussion a long time before the congress, but the document did not have many significant amendments in its final form. The basic aim of the movement is to promote in every possible way the political, economic, and spiritual growth of the nation. "Our movement," the document says, "is not directed against any people. Our principle is to live in peace and cooperate with everyone. But we believe that peace and cooperation are only possible when they are based on justice and when there is no infringement of any people's rights. The movement will continue its struggle for a fair resolution to the problem of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast."

A significant part of the program is devoted to problems of the state language and independence in economic policy. Membership of the AOD does not depend on nationality or religious convictions.

Representatives of the Armenian diaspora and the country's informal associations and foreign journalists took part in the congress' work. S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, made an address at the congress.

Academician Sees Strong Armenian Position

NC0811175489 Yerevan KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN in Armenian 27 Oct 89 P 3

[Article by Nikolay Ovannisyan, vice-president of the Oriental Studies Institute of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic and professor of historical sciences, entitled: "Armenia Is Stronger Now"]

[Excerpts] At present Armenia—its present situation, future and destiny—is the fundamental pivot of concern for all Armenians. Although there exists no unequivocal assessment of these extremely vital problems, nevertheless one has the impression that pessimistic sentiments predominate and that there is an inclination to paint the situation in dramatic hues and depict the future in dark colors. [passage omitted]

The problem is: What standpoint and criteria should be adopted in assessing the prevailing situation in Armenia? If we base our assessment on traditional approaches, within the framework of the old thinking, then the situation might really appear exceedingly grave and even insoluble. [passage omitted]. However, if we formulate new criteria for evaluation and new political thinking, and on this basis assess the situation in and around Armenia engendered by the liberation movement of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] during the last 1 and ½ years, then the picture will be drastically different. We will then see that not only is there no cause for dejection and panic, but there are many things to be proud of. I could even insist that Armenia, throughout the 70-year existence of the Soviet regime, has never been so strong as it is now.

There will probably be those who would ask doubtfully what such an assessment is based upon.

Let us reply.

The strength of a nation should not be deduced solely from the size of its territory and population or its economic potential. [passage omitted] One of the most fundamental indicators of a nation's strength is its cohesive national outlook and psychological make-up. With the Armenians, the importance of this tenet has conspicuously manifested itself during the last 1 ½ years. Radical and qualitative changes have taken place in the national consciousness and psychology of the Armenian people. It has transformed itself from being a nation dependent on someone else into a nation which relies primarily on its own powers. [passage omitted]

The unprecedented unification of the ranks of the Armenian people and the consolidation of cohesiveness between the different social groups and generations has become yet another source of strength for Armenia. [passage omitted]

Another factor strengthening Armenia has been the recent ethnic consolidation, which in a sense, happened independently of our will. It has come about because of the immigration of nearly 215,000 Armenians from Azerbaijan (outside the NKAO borders) into Armenia and, as a reciprocal consequence of that, the emigration of nearly 153,000 Azeribaijanis from our republic. Essentially, it constituted a population exchange. It resulted in a population increase in our republic in favour of Armenians and assured its future ethnic homogeneity. [passage omitted] Besides, now that virtually no Armenians are left in Azerbaijan, a lever for pressuring and threatening Armenia and impeding its actions has been eliminated. This means that our republic's position is now more secure and our republic is able to be more active and decisive. [passage omitted]

A further factor which has immensely strengthened Armenia has been the new level and quality of relations between Soviet Armenia, the motherland, and its illegally detached child the NKAO. [passage omitted] Because of the enhancement of the role of Armenia as regards the NKAO problem, the central authorities as well as individual republics are forced to negotiate with her. This indubitably confirms an increase in the influence of Armenia. [passage omitted].

Armenian Movement Paper Begins Publication

NC0311165989 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 2 Nov 89

[Text] The first issue of HAYK, a new weekly, appeared today at the publications department of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee. Here is a report by our colleague Armine Tutujyan:

[Begin recording] [Tutjyan] Freedom Square became a place for self-cleansing and baptism taking its inspiration from the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. On this spot we have awakened from 70 years of apathy which is the first step on our return to national identity. [words indistinct] We have rediscovered the meaning of our existence and our self-esteem; we have now seen the light of salvation which rests in us alone. Artsakh [NKAO] has chosen the freedom road of no return; the Armenian people have found the path of freedom. The path of slavery and bridges of retreat have been destroyed. But what about the losses we have suffered? It is well said that one does not beg justice but grasps it. And in the struggle for happiness and freedom there are not just victories.

We read such lines in the first issue of the official organ of the Pan-National Armenian Movement which appeared today.

It has been 2 years since the Pan-National Armenian Movement began. In the beginning, it had no organizational structure and undertook its activities through general assembly meetings. However, each movement has its logical progression of development and phases. It is now urgent that the movement take a progressive organizational form and establish ties with our people, not through general assembly meetings but through the press. Similar movements in other Soviet republics already have their own press. Today, 2 November, will be a watershed in the annals of the Pan-National Armenian Movement.

Why is the official organ called HAYK? The paper's editor, Stavrel Gevorgyan, responds:

[Gevorgyan] HAYK is the name given to our people and is also the name of our country. The goal of our national struggle is to unite with our brothers dispersed all over the world and with Artsakh. HAYK is, after all, a word that describes us all. As you say, many papers appear in the republic but they occassionally [words indistinct] present the problems facing our people superficially. Their interpretations are wrong and we know how the central press and television frequently represent the developments as regarding the NKAO, the grave situation of the earthquake relief efforts and refugee problems. We want to present all these problems to the people openly and in a civilized manner, and not with bad intentions as some surmise. We want to establish an open dialogue with the people, to learn their views, to make practical proposals, involve the republic's intellectuals and scientists, and thus create a national program and convey it to the people through the press.

[Tutujyan] Today's issue includes the draft program and draft by-laws of the Pan-National Armenian Movement, an extensive article by history professor Ktrich Sartaryan entitled "It Is Time for Unity," and an article by Karen Simonyan on the problems of Armenian people's national struggle in its current phase. There are also items on the course of restoration work in the disaster zone and on the refugee problem.

The paper consists of eight pages and has a circulation of 100,000. The income from the first issue's sales will be donated to charity. [end recording]

Yerevan on Train Unloading Situation

NC0911120089 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 9 Nov 89

[Text] The extraordinary situation on Armenian railroads has been extended until 31 December for unloading the cars at the republic's train stations and moving freight. Weeks ago when not a single railcar arrived from Azerbaijan because of the well-known blockade, the republic's many stations were completely idle. Now the situation has changed radically.

Stranded in Azerbaijan for weeks and months, the flow of railroad cars into the republic has sharply increased over the last few days. The extension of the extraordinary situation until the end of the year aims at dealing with this situation.

On 7 November 182 railroad cars entered Yerevan railway station and all were unloaded because all the customer enterprises were ready. The organizations—flour mill combine, condensed feeds factory, [names indistinct]—belonging to food industry ministry work efficiently.

The unloading of railcars has transcended the narrow circle of functionaries and has become a pan-national question. That is, if we want to emerge quickly from the extraordinary situation, all the enterprises, educational institutions, and many other organizations must exhibit patriotic initiative; that is they have to organize weekend work to help railcar unloading.

From this point of view, the initiative of the Aparan's [word indistinct] factory collective is highly encouraging. Each Saturday, a group of 20-25 individuals from the factory collective is going to Spitak and are helping in the unloading. This is not an isolated case. Many enterprises and organizations in the republic are working with similar patriotic inspiration. Their example must be universally emulated.

'Tense Calm' Prevails in Nagorno-Karabakh

LD0811173789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 8 Nov 89

[Text] Our special correspondent Sergey Omelchenko describes how Nagorno-Karabakh is marking the October holiday.

[Omelchenko] There is a relatively calm situation on the eve of the holiday, but this is a tense calm. People are tired of uncertainty and constant fear for their future, and for their near and dear. Some are disappointed in authoritative figures and indisputable values both of their lives and of our society in general. There are quite active forces which are craftily fanning up these negative emotions through rumors and falsifications, thereby guiding people along an erroneous path. The hope still flickers in people, however, that the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh will be resolved.

I would like also to give a report from the headquarters of the commandants office of the special district internal troops, which shows how these days have passed and what the situation is today. Yesterday, peaceful processions took place in the towns of Agdam, Mir-Bashir, and Fizuli. No violations of public order were registered. Internal troops personnel laid a wreath and flowers at a monument to Lenin, and troops marched by. A sanctioned rally was held in Stepanakert yesterday as well, and about 1,000 people attended it.

More cheerful news: Two trains have arrived at the railroad station, one containing eight railcars of potatoes, sugar, and consumer goods, and the other containing tankloads of gasoline, kerosene, and diesel fuel, which is badly needed here in the Autonomous Oblast. Despite the holiday, unpleasant events took place. Shoot-outs could be heard in various rayons of the Autonomous Oblast, while in the village of Arachadzor about 200 people demanded that Azerbaijani families be removed from the village. Such events are not now a rare occurrence in the Autonomous Oblast. Yet, officers from the internal troops had conversations with residents and the conflict was settled. This is an individual solution to a specific conflict, but the residents of Nagorno-Karabakh are waiting for a final and complete solution to the problem of the autonomous oblast.

Correspondent Reports Situation in Stepanakert

LD0511222989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Nov 89

[A. Barkhatov video report from Stepanakert; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [A. Barkhatov] The day of our film crew started in a line at the only operating gas station in Stepanakert. [video shows line of vehicles at a gas station] Almost all civilian transport vehicles are filled in the city from this rubber hose. No additional capacity is required. There are no fuel reserves. They arrive in the oblast, as before, occasionally. Even the emergency ration for ambulances has been cut tenfold. It would seem that in the general state of nervousness, all voices of common sense have been lost. And for us, this meeting was completely unexpected.

[Unidentified man speaking to film crew] Let's sit in any vehicle and we'll go to see friends of mine I've worked with a long time.

[Barkhatov] Where?

[Man] We'll go to Agdam—the neighboring rayon...

[Barkhatov] To the Azerbaijani...

[Man] To the neighboring Azerbaijani rayon. I've got friends there. We'll sit down and have a chat. They will receive us. You will see for yourselves that we are friends and there is no kind of feuding or anything between us. Well, it was to someone's advantage to stir things up in order to say that we're enemies. We are not enemies nor will we be.

[Barkhatov] Out of the rhythm of blockade life, which has become commonplace, one can't seize on anything in particular that one might note as an event. Like a blueprint which has been inked-in twice, the situation has frozen, with tension building up inside. And, as before, the number of refugees in the town is around 13,000. The housing question has grown extremely acute. There are not enough hotels and hostels, and people are living in basements. [video shows an old woman in room divided by hanging-carpet partitions]

According to a government decision, thousands of cubic meters of reinforced concrete products have been unloaded and dispatched for Nagorno Karabakh. Specialists from other republics have consulted on methods of accelerated construction—but all for nothing. Yes, the greater part of the freight has been blocked on the way, but it is hardly comforting to ascertain that neither the local authorities nor the special administration committee have the resources to accompany convoys. [video shows streets scenes, woman filling can of water from a spring, lines of railway cars, shot of interior of train driver's cabin with its windows smashed in.]

We are in a broadcasting equipment room of Stepanakert Television. [Video shows Barkhatov standing in front of an array of TV monitors] Before you are two screens. This is what is being broadcast and this is an operational one. There you are: a broadcast prepared by the Stepanakert editorial office was just running, and then, via the relay station in the town of Shusha—Azerbaijan—that is what is now on air. The broadcasts from Stepanakert television are continuing, and Shusha has already cut off the signal [video shows Shusha broadcasting different program]

Confrontation on the air feeds various rumors. But the essence is simple. Stepanakert can go on the air up to 1 hour every 24 hours, no more. But our colleagues here have decided to rest on Saturday and Sunday, and at the expense of broadcasts intended for their days off, to increase the on-air time on weekdays. That's how things were until September, until Shusha changed the arithmetic in its own way. One can only guess what spark will be struck and when out of the clash between the dubious initiative of one side and the intransigence of the other.

Scant Information on NKAO Upsets Soldiers

PM0611110789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Nov 89 First Edition p 2

[Report by Captain M. Kislov under the rubric "From the Work Experience of the Commission on Interethnic Relations": "How the Vacuum Is Being Filled"]

[Text] Transbaykal Military District—Everyone knows how difficult life is for the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples at present and is aware of the dramatic situation that has taken shape around the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh. It is perfectly natural that servicemen of Azerbaijani nationality, finding themselves far from home, also do not feel at ease. They read articles on everything concerning events in the region from beginning to end, as they say, closely follow radio and television reports, and greedily devour any little piece of news from home.

However, the central mass media are not fully satisfying this interest. Servicemen want to know more than is reported in the newspapers and on radio and television. What is possibly perfectly sufficient for a Russian, Kazakh, or Belorussian is not enough for them....

... The commission on interethnic relations attached to the military district's political directorate received a report from the N Garrison on the appearance of unhealthy attitudes among servicemen of Azerbaijani nationality. Major General N. Rybolovkin, chairman of the commission and first deputy chief of the military district's political directorate, flew immediately to the garrison with a group of officers. They conducted intensive work for several days in the units and subunits, during which time they established the following.

At the beginning of October soldiers and sergeants of Azerbaijani nationality secretly held a meeting in one of the subunits which was attended by two or three representatives of every unit in the formation. The participants adopted a decision to draft a letter on behalf of all Azerbaijani servicemen to the formation commander requesting that they be transferred to Azerbaijan to continue their service. Their aim: To protect their friends and families and help to establish order and calm in the republic. They threatened to boycott service in the event of their being refused. Or, to put it simply, they threatened to go on strike.

The letter was drafted a few days later. Members of the "organizational committee," Sergeant F. Mirgosanov, Private F. Nasirov, Private I. Gafarov, and others, began to collect signatures. However, not all servicemen agreed to sign the ultimatum. This caused strong feeling. It is hard to say how it would all have ended if there had not been timely intervention by officers in the political directorate and the formation command. They managed to defuse the serious situation.

It still seemed too soon, however, to bring down the curtain on this episode. The same conclusion was reached by members of the military district commission on interethnic relations. During their work at the garrison, they made persistent efforts to establish the real state of affairs in order to prevent a repetition of anything similar in other military collectives. Their investigation showed that one of the causes of the incident was the shortage of objective, considered information on events in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], Azerbaijan, and Armenia. The thin trickle of information in the central press, as we have already said, did not satisfy servicemen drafted from the Transcaucasus. And any vacuum, as we know, has the property to fill itself. But with what?

Azerbaijani servicemen had been passing around clippings from newspapers sent to them from their own republic. I have seen a few of these clippings myself and read translations of this material. I can say that the opinions and assessments contained in them far from always coincide with those given in the central press. Take, for example, an article entitled "A Short Day in the Life Of," published on 23 September in the republic Komsomol Central Committee newspaper MOLODEZH AZERBAYDZHANA. Journalist S. Bagirova describes the extremely dramatic situation in the city of Shusha. Describing looting by extremists from the "Great Armenia" organization, of which Azerbaijanis are the victims, she quotes a woman living in the city as saying that "Comrade Volskiy is on the side of the Armenian extremists, and that is why these riots happen."

The servicemen passed around the tattered, thumbed newspaper, getting together in groups, reading it aloud, and discussing the contents. Is there any need to point out the concern that this and other such tendentious publications caused them? Incidentally, it was an article like this that prompted the writing of the infamous letter. Its author, Private Gafarov, told me:

"A friend of mine was sent a newspaper from home containing an article which said that many Azerbaijani families are hiring soldiers to protect them against Armenian extremists. I did not believe it at first. I said to the men that this could not be. But Private Aliyev came back from leave and said that it was true. After that we decided that we must go and serve at home so that we ourselves could ensure the safety of our relatives...."

This shortage of information has been made worse by the fact that, for a long time now, there have been big delays in letters from the republic reaching the garrison. Soldiers sometimes have to wait 2-3 months for news from home. And it is extremely difficult to get through on the telephone from here to Azerbaijan or the NKAO. I was given the following information at the local postal division: Not even one in four of those who order calls can hear the voices of their friends and family. Telephonists' appeals usually meet with the stereotyped response: No lines....

With no accurate information available, people become easy prey for rumors. And they were constantly abroad in the barracks: the most improbable, dramatic rumors. Someone heard from someone, someone told someone else....

In this situation a few intelligent, authoritative words from a superior—commander, political worker, or Communist—were both necessary and appropriate. A few words to reassure people, dispel their fears, and sweep aside the idle conjectures of irresponsible journalists. Unfortunately, these words were rarely, very rarely forthcoming in the barracks. It is hardly any wonder that some hotheads came up with the idea of getting sent home to counter the "terror of the Armenians."

The fact that, prior to being drafted into the Army, some soldiers and sergeants had been involved in antisocial demonstrations and had had time to absorb extremist ideas to a greater or lesser degree also played a role in the events. Private I. Gafarov frankly told me that he had attended unsanctioned rallies more than once and that he shared the ideas of those proposing to work for the republic's secession from the USSR and favoring the creation of their own "Azerbaijani Army."

In this connection I will risk voicing the supposition that the members of the initiative group acted not without outside instructions; this supposition does have real foundation. Talking in one of the units with Azerbaijani servicemen, Lieutenant Colonel R. Zimaliyev learned, for example, that, before conscription, representatives of the Azerbaijani People's Front had advised some of them to work hard at their military training so as to later struggle for a "free Azerbaijan" with weapons in their hands. Senior Lieutenant I. Abdulayev told me that when he was on leave representatives of the Azerbaijani People's Front turned up at his parents' house and directly proposed that the officer leave the Armed Forces and head one of the fighter subunits, no more no less....

The reasonable question arises: Did the commanders, political workers, and Communists in the formation know about all this? And what did they do to prevent unhealthy attitudes from arising among the servicemen, to remove their fears and concerns, and to exert an influence on those under the influence of others' ideas?

Unfortunately, prior to what happened, purposeful, systematic work to explain the nature of events taking place in the Transcaucasian republics and to conduct the international, patriotic education of personnel was done badly. People's attitudes were not seriously studied by anyone. They mainly got by with "hackneyed" political information sessions and talks that in substance did not go beyond the limits of what was reported in the central press. The commission and groups responsible for interethnic relations did virtually nothing. But in such a sensitive area as interethnic relations, mass events must certainly be underpinned by painstaking, individual work. Indeed, is it really possible to persuade a person under the influence of tendentious newspaper articles, various provocative rumors, and the ideas of extremist groups in the blink of an eye with the aid of a political information session or talk? Personal communication is needed here first and foremost, and also dialogue rather than the monologue of an instructor. A patient, amicable, trusting dialogue based on knowledge of the situation and people's moods.

But, figuratively speaking, they only began to cross themselves after the thunder had rumbled. But, even then, the emphasis was again placed on mass events: the same old political information sessions, talks, and meetings of personnel. In other words, they took the easiest, least effective course of action. Amendments were made to educational work only after the arrival at the garrison of members of the military district's commission on interethnic relations. Officers from the political directorate gave an example of the kind of action that should be taken in the situation. Splitting up among the units and subunits, they spoke individually with dozens of soldiers and sergeants, actively joined in discussions, and answered disturbing questions frankly and knowledgeably. Only after this did the tension among Azerbaijani servicemen begin to ease.

However, Major General N. Rybolovkin frankly warned the leadership of the formation that this was certainly no cause for calm and complacency. The work done was only the beginning. It must be continued and conducted persistently on a daily basis, taking account of the CPSU Central Committee September Plenum requirements and the recommendations of the All-Army Conference of Ideological Workers.

It is hard not to agree with the words of an experienced political worker. There can be no ebbing and flowing in international and patriotic education. It must be conducted constantly, and always on the basis of present-day realities. Any euphoria is fraught with the most unpleasant consequences. But there is one disturbing thought: Are our commanders, political workers, and party and Komsomol activists sufficiently armed with knowledge to work efficiently with people?

Let me remind you that one of the causes of the tense situation that arose in the formation was the ambiguousness of assessments of the events in the Transcaucasian republics in the central and local press organs. Not without reason, soldiers and sergeants of Azerbaijani nationality have demanded that leaders of both republics give objective information on the situation and a program of action through the press. Or another question. How should work be conducted with Private Gafarov and Private Nasirov, who, even before their army service, were influenced by all kinds of functionaries from informal, extremist organizations? With general words and slogans? It is quite clear that, for this kind of work, the teacher himself must be familiar with the program of the Azerbaijani People's Front, for example.

In order to conduct assertive ideological work, full, reliable information is as essential as the air we breathe. But where is it to be obtained? It would be good, of course, if the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy and the political directorates of the Ground Forces and military districts were to make themselves responsible for providing this information. A great deal, of course, can be done at local level. Surely our commissions on interethnic relations are capable of organizing close contacts with the leadership of the union republics? The units have tape recorders and video equipment. If an appeal, say, by the first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee to servicemen were to be recorded, this would do away with a lot of questions. And surely there would be some benefit in visits to military collectives by representative delegations from Armenia and Azerbaijan?

Incidentally, the Georgian leadership has set a good example in this respect. This autumn alone, the military district has been visited by two delegations of party, soviet, and Komsomol workers from that union republic. The guests have volunteered to regularly send video and audio cassettes to the units with subjects on modern-day life in Georgia and instructions from mothers and fathers to their sons. An accord has been reached for several Georgian artistic collectives to visit the Transbaykal Military District.

Several days after returning from the garrison where the events described had occurred, I spoke to the formation's political department on the telephone. They told me that there are no unhealthy manifestations among Azerbaijani servicemen. They are continuing to fulfill their duty to the motherland. Individual work is being conducted with the members of the "organizational committee." Disciplinary measures have not been taken against them.

Well, that is just as it should be. Those who stray from the path must be educated. Educated by plain, honest speaking, convincing facts, and good advice.

Blockade of Nagorno-Karabakh Continuing

NC0311122589 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 2 Nov 89

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet has passed a resolution concerning urgent measures to ensure the uninterrupted operation of the rail transportation system and the vital branches of the national economy. Decisions are being taken but to no avail, writes YEREKOYAN YEREVAN newspaper. It is as though these were not the decisions of the supreme authority of our country. Do the organizers of the blockade have so much license that they do not have to submit to our supreme authority? The blockade of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] is continuing. The abundant riches of the land of Artsakh [NKAO] remain in storerooms or outside under the open sky because the Azerbaijan "internationalists," to quote, have blocked the major route and do not allow these products to be dispatched through their territory to the fraternal peoples of the great Soviet family in Moscow, Siberia, Tyumen, and other cities and regions. These peoples complain that the people of Artsakh are not fulfilling their contractual obligations. No one listens to the people of Artsakh. These peoples ask for indemnity. But for what offense? Who should be giving an account to the Artsakh worker who has been condemned to forced idleness and who is in a difficult financial situation and cannot sell his produce?

Today, there is a most urgent need for roads in Artsakh: roads which lead to Artsakh and which connect it with the outside world. Roads have always been a problem for Artsakh. Back in 1918, the National Council of Artsakh considered road building its major task. At the time nearly 200 km of roads linking various parts of Artsakh were built. However, these efforts did not attain their objectives. In 1920 road construction was terminated: the regime had changed. And ever since Artsakh has suffered from a shortage of roads. Many settlements in the oblast are isolated and thus are under double blockade.

The Artsakh people, taking a lesson from their "good neighbours," will in the future circumvent them as regards their vital arteries. They will attach themselves to mother Armenia, after which no power will be able to detach them from each other.

Kazakh Party Official on Election Campaign

PM0311091089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Nov 89 First Edition pp 1-2

[Article by Yu. Kotunov, secretary of Aktyubinsk Kazakh Communist Party Oblast Committee (obkom), under the rubric "The Party and the Elections to the Soviets": "We Cannot Be Bystanders"]

[Text] It is probably clear to everyone that the forthcoming local soviet elections will not be easy. And each republic has its own peculiarities. In Kazakhstan, for instance, there is still a quota from social organizations, while in other republics they are deciding differently. There are other differences too. But without a doubt the voters' demands on their envoys to the soviets have increased, and the conditions of deputies' work have become more difficult. For this reason there are cases of people withdrawing their names as early as the stage of nomination of candidates. On the other hand, it cannot be ruled out that people who are by no means the best may be nominated to the organs of power. People, say, who are eloquent, but do not know how to organize work, or who have careerist aspirations, are incompetent, or are capable only of demanding manna from heaven.

What position should party organizations adopt here? A wait-and-see attitude? Let everything take care of itself? We have electoral commissions, people say, let them look after it, and the party organizations can join in at the final stage. No, in my view we must become involved in the election campaign immediately and act resolutely. Otherwise we will have to work in a more complex situation and once again, as happened at the elections of USSR people's deputies, in the voters' eyes we will be entrenched, rather than in the vanguard. Today, to wait and see is to lose the political initiative and show—I am not afraid to use the word—irresponsibility.

Why, in fact, is the party meddling, so to speak, in the election campaign? Because it has always stood up for soviet power, for the strengthening of the soviets at every level. For soviets—with workers, peasants, and Communists. It has always stood up for socialism. For some reason, we are nowadays embarassed to talk about Marxist-Leninist ideology and its development. Are we flirting with the radicals and trimming to fit the sentiments that exist in society? That is perhaps too simple an explanation. I think the point lies elsewhere. In the age of pluralism of opinions, social concepts and people's feelings and actions are put to the test, and democracy develops in a process of debates and disputes. But pluralism is productive only where there is unity of action, achieved by democratic means. But what sometimes happens in practice? Attacks are made on the party, but as soon as you seriously enter the fray, the demagogic shout of "diktat" begins. Under this pressure, some Communists show themselves to be pusillanimous, while others simply lack the knowledge and skills of political struggle. Hence a certain lack of staunchness, so that party members give in, even in cases where the "critics" have nothing on their side except cheek and oratorical skills.

Of course, we must be realists. We must take into account the political, economic, and social situation, which some people—and not without justification—call a crisis, a disaster. We must take into account that a struggle for power is under way. It is unreasonable and even immoral to stand aside from this struggle. Who will lead people who have grown up under socialism and will accept no alternative, and where will they lead them? People believe that the party of Lenin will lead them. It is the party that will help us to put our socialist choice into practice.

Our party obkom published an election platform formulating the main provisions associated with the democratization of party and social life and proposing specific ways out of economic impasses. The platform has a clearly expressed social thrust. And we took into account the fact that the center of social activeness is shifting to the rayons and cities. Indeed, people are increasingly beginning to realize that they themselves must transform local life—in both economic and social terms. Hence the growing role of the local soviets. It is they who have to head this concrete work, on the results of which people will judge the state, socialism, and the potential inherent in it. And this makes our common task all the more pressing—to elect to the soviets those who are capable of carrying out intensive organizational work, giving people enthusiasm for real action, and rectifying the situation.

There will undoubtedly be candidates who rely on lightweight authority won by means of forceful slogans. It is our duty to help people to study these slogans and put their trust in real personalities, not imaginary ones. If a person is capable of carrying out his plans at the collective farm [kolkhoz] or plant, without shifting the burden onto other people or expecting manna from heaven, that means he is worthy of being a people's deputy. Otherwise, it sometimes happens that someone puts a question bluntly to the next higher organization: Come on, do it!—and thinks that he has thereby justified the voters' hopes. Of course, the ability and persistence to formulate an urgent problem are also necessary qualities. But I do not think anyone will deny that they should be combined with competence and practicality.

Just imagine now, in our oblast we have to elect more than 3,600 people's deputies to the soviets at all levels. With contested elections, the number of equal candidates increases many times over. Hence it is clear that enormous work lies ahead. And the Communists cannot stand aside from the nomination of candidates, the organization of tens of thousands of meetings with voters, and all the pre-election work. How should it be approached, how should it be conducted? It is clear that the old approaches are not suitable. But what approach do we need?

We often talk about political methods of work, but to this day even a relatively educated party worker cannot always explain clearly what this means. Because in our day-to-day activity we have often merely professed these methods, while continuing to rely more on intraparty discipline and democratic centralism in the one-sided sense. True, greater endeavor and initiative has emerged recently. I will try here to express my thoughts on political methods in our work with regard to the tasks of the election campaign.

First of all, I am convinced that the influence of party organizations both on the voters' choice and on the candidates themselves will beecome increasingly marked if we are more emphatic in our insistence on the transformation of the social sphere in every labor collective and every settlement. These questions—food supplies, improving transportation, the construction of housing, schools, kindergartens, and so forth—should be given priority in our programs. But it must always be borne in mind that the winner will be not the one who makes a lot of promises, but the one who immediately sets about fulfilling his election program along with the voters. People do not want talkers, but organizers, who will begin to move forward, if only by tiny steps. That is why even at the nomination stage we are trying to save candidates from the temptation to promise "castles in the air." It is worth remembering here that to implement everything that was promised by candidate USSR people's deputies at election meetings would take...more than R3 trillion, or seven times the country's annual budget. Now it is clear to everyone that no one needs these "castles." But at that time, in the course of the election contests, they helped some people to take off.

We have set up information and methodological centers at the oblast House of Political Enlightenment and the political enlightenment rooms in rayon centers. Here it is always possible to obtain the necessary socioeconomic information, information that is, most importantly, objective. Furthermore these centers will help candidates to draw up their own realistic election program, obtain legal advice, and prepare speeches. The candidates will also be given assistance by people who are familiar with political, economic, and social information and know how to conduct open discussions with working people.

Given today's diversity of opinions and a certain cautiousness with regard to proposals made by the party apparatus, it is simply not possible to conduct this work successfully without the support of the broad aktiv and economic leaders. In our oblast there are more than 2,000 settlements, most of which have fewer than 100 inhabitants. In the majority of auls and villages, managers of livestock units and departments and team leaders have been elected chairmen of the ward electoral commissions. As a rule they have quite a good knoweldge of the moral and political situation in the collectives and the villagers' needs. They are relatively influential people, many of them are Communists, and the party organizations could pursue their policy actively through these people. For instance, if a manager or team leader asks the respected elders for advice on a candidacy for the rural or rayon soviet, he will probably receive a businesslike proposal. And the candidate they nominate will not, of course, be deprived of their firm support in the elections, and after that in his work as a deputy.

Here is something I would like to draw attention to. In my view we do not exert party political influence over all population groups equally. It is usually workers in trade, transportation, consumer services, medical institutions, sports organizations, and so forth who are lost sight of. Yet every day they are dealing with people, and in fact they not infrequently become informal propagandists. For instance, a cab driver, in conversations with chance passengers, can, depending on his own feelings, speak well or poorly of a particular candidate people's deputy. This kind of information sticks in the mind. And there are hundreds, even thousands of instances of this. Can it all be left out of the reckoning?

We believe that clerks or "notifiers" are no longer need, as before, in agitation collectives. Their forms of work can be diverse. For instance, separate support groups are being set up for each candidate, based on the collective that nominated him. There is also work for agitators in neighborhoods. It must be admitted that at the moment this is a vulnerable area for us. They will be helped by clubs, libraries, "red corners," stockmen's institutes, social and teaching complexes, various social councils, and mobile agitation teams.

I believe the ethical side of the election struggle should also not be forgotten. Here too nothing should be oversimplified. The last elections showed that some candidates and their supporters were unscrupulous about their methods, seeking at any price to become the focus of public attention and sometimes exerting literally all-out pressure on voters and on their rivals. In particular, the so-called "fence" campaigning became widespread, whereby banners, posters, samizdat appeals, notices, and other campaigning materials are persistently posted wherever and however possible. Now, as you know, all visual election campaigning and political advertising will be carried out on equal terms, from funds allocated centrally, under the public's eye. Special boards and hoardings are being set up in certain places in the electoral ward.

Of course, political methods also include influencing people's hearts and minds through the press and the other mass media. True, as yet not many of us venture to write to the newspaper. Demands on the quality of published items have increased, and that is, of course, a good thing. But it often happens that, say, a rayon newspaper is produced by between five and seven full-time journalists. Naturally, it is difficult to make it interesting. Therefore we intend to supplement these newspapers' editorial collegiums with worker and rural correspondents and experienced specialists. The objective is this: without lowering the level of criticism of shortcomings, to strengthen the constructive, organizational element and help editorial offices to give a well-argued reply to those who are fond of making malicious attacks on the soviets and the party. I think Lenin's view is still relevant today: "We assume the workers have created their newspaper so that it can **defend** Marxism, not in order to allow it to misrepresent Marxism in the spirit of bourgeois 'scholars.'" In using the press and radio, Communists do not, of course, intend to act as controllers or inspectors. The purpose of such press items is to help organize work and give advice on the basis of one's own experience.

The months-long election campaign has begun in the oblast. Party organizations have every opportunity not to be bystanders, but to give active support to the true champions of perestroyka and the party's ideological platform.

Kiev Radio Program Discusses Nationalities Issue

LD0611103889 Kiev in English to Europe
1900 GMT 3 Nov 89

[Excerpts] [Premier Gubekno] Hello and welcome. I'm Aleksey Gubenko inviting you to the "Open Studio", a discussion program on Radio Kiev in which we explore the most pressing issues of life here in the Ukraine, as well as in the rest of the Soviet Union. Our studio guests tonight are Dr (Oleg Shamshur), historian and sociologist and now a freelance researcher, and Andrey Kulikov, member of the main board of the Taras Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society and vice president of the coordinating committee of the Kiev branch of the Ukrainian popular movement known as Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka]. Tonight we're going to discuss one pressing issue, namely the ethnic policies undertaken by hte country's leaders to cushion some of the frictions and tensions that have popped up recently. [passage omitted]

Do you believe that now we have a new possibility to establish somehow the sovereignty [of the Ukraine], in the true sense of the word, keeping intact the integrity with other republics? Andrey Kulikov, what is your idea?

[Kulikov] Well, my idea is that we can, although we have to be very, very much, very cautious in trying to do this because as the national rebirth in Ukraine started to develop, as people felt more Ukrainian than they tended to feel in previous years, the reaction in response started to develop as well, and there are voices now which say that, for instance, the law on languages in the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] was a fault and that the Supreme Soviet should not have proclaimed the Ukrainian language the state langauge of the republic, but should proclaim two languages, Ukrainian and Russian. This shows that there are, I would say, unitarianist or even chauvinistic trends, chauvinistic ideas, prevailing in some strata of the population. [passage omitted]

[Gubenko] A question to Dr (Shamshur) Do you believe that we can avoid ethnic strife here in the Ukraine, looking at al the developments that are taking place in this republic?

[Shamshur] Well, unfortunately, now we have here more and more and more unrest, especially in the western part of the republic. Well, the only answer is that the degree of our possibility, our capacity, to avoid it, would depend primarily on our abilities to learn from lessons from the developments in other parts of our country. That is my first point. Secondly, I think it's very important to (remind) about, say, some traditions and, say, cultural backgrounds. I don't believe that the strife and the unrest here can be as bad as it is now in the Caucasus. But I think that primarily it would depend on the how the problems, very urgent and pressing problems, in the field of economy, in the social sphere, how they would be solved, or they won't be solved. If we have stalemate, if we have no progress, if we found ourselves in a blind alley, well, the development of events can be unpredictable, but I don't believe so.

[Gubenko] Andrey Kulikov, you're one of the active members of the Rukh, of the popular movement of the Ukraine. How do you and your associates in the Rukh look at this development, and do you believe that your organization can contain some of the left-wingers, or right-wingers—call them whatever you want—you know some people call them extremists, in the ranks of the Rukh?

[Kulikov] You know, I would like to say, to make a statement, about the ideas of very high tensions in the Western parts of our Republic. Just a week ago I was in Lvov, this major city of Western Ukraine, and I was going there, judging from the official press, that there's really very huge tension there, and probably a man who would speak Russian, which is my native tongue, would be at least found dead. But I spent a whole day there and nobody reacted in any negative way to my speaking Russian, and you know, I believe ithat what is going on in Western regions is not the prelude to ethnic strife, but rather a conflict between the major part of ithe population and the people who are in power and who still tend to act by the methods of so-called command and administrative system, and because this system, for years, and for decades, was the upbringing for those—call them bureaucrats or officials—in a denationalized way, then it may look like an ethnic strife. I met Jews and Poles and Russians in Lvov, and an Armenian too, and they said—almost all of them said—they did not feel any bad feelings from the part of the Ukrainian population towards them. Now, about the capability of the Rukh to control extremist elements within the Rukh proper: I believe that we will be able to control most of them. Of course, I cannot say for sure that this will be done 99 percent, because the Rukh at the moment is very diverse conglomerate of different people with different political outlooks, and because our citizens don't have the experience of culture political activity, some of them are very ...[Kulikov changes thought] are in the state of euphoria, and they tend to stage loud demonstrations and mass rallies which really can look like a threat to some people who are not used to it. [passage omitted]

Ukrainian Poll Results on Election Draft Laws

90UN0186 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 43, 28 Oct 89 p 4

[Article by V. Paniotto, doctor of philosophical sciences: "What a Poll of the Citizens Showed"]

[Text] The Ukrainian branch of the Soviet Sociology Association and the Central Ukraine branch of the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion conducted a poll of the citizens on draft laws on elections and appropriate additions to the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Constitution which have been published.

A majority of respondents believes that the candidates from public organizations should be elected by territorial district on the same conditions as the other candidates. No less definite is the assessment of two-tier elections of the republic Supreme Soviet. Approximately 60 percent believes that the Supreme Soviet should be elected directly by all citizens.

Only 15 percent of those polled considers that the constituency electoral commissions should be accorded the right to cancel a candidate's registration if it believes that his program is not in keeping with the requirements of the election law.

The vast majority advocated the democratization of the formation of the electoral commissions. Their members should be elected at meetings or conferences of the workforce. Some 66 percent of those polled declared that the conditions at the time of nomination of candidates should be common for all. A candidate should have the right to collect the requisite number of votes for nomination both at one meeting and at several—per the sum total of votes cast for his nomination. The majority of respondents advocated that the ballot for the nomination of candidates be secret. The rights of the candidates for deputy, those polled believe, should not depend on the office they hold—whether their activity extends to the territory of the republic, oblast or city or not.

1 Oct Lvov Incident To Be Investigated

LD0711115789 Kiev in Ukrainian to North America 2200 GMT 3 Nov 89

[Text] Results of the investigation by the special parliamentary commission into the 1 October incident in Lvov between groups of local youths and law-and-order forces were made available to the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

Here is what Yaroslav Gil, member of the commission, and USSR people's deputy from Ternopol oblast, told us by telephone in this connection.

[Begin Gil recording] The results, in the main, boil down to the following. The situation could have been stabilized by peaceful means. Certain workers of the Internal Affairs Ministry stated that in the beginning, no aggressive intentions on the part of young people were noticeable. They had gathered outside the city's interior department building, but did not display any form of aggression and there was no need to resort to so-called means of active defense.

What were the consequences? Well, there were nearly 70 victims, up to 20 militiamen and over 45 citizens. The figures only include those who asked for medical assistance, but there were many who did not. There were no grave injuries.

We proposed to the internal affairs ministries of the USSR and the Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic, and also to the Lvov oblast interior directorate to discover as soon as possible the reasons which led to such an undesirable development of events, and to punish all those found guilty. [end recording]

As soon as the competent organs pronounce the final verdict in the so-called Lvov case, we will immediately report it to you, esteemed listeners.

Increased Tension in Lvov

90UN0210A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 1 Nov 89 p 3

[Article by L. Sotnik, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA staff correspondent in Lvov: "Counting on Bans"]

[Text] Demonstrations in Lvov, Stryy, Sambor... Noisy processions move along the streets decked out in yellow-blue flags. On Lenin Prospect in the center of Lvov, some kind of permanently operating ideological center has sprung up. Some call it the "flower bed" for brevity's sake; others, "Hyde Park." Strong, brawny, "muscle-bound" fellows fairly often picket the procuracy buildings and police departments demanding the release of these or those arrested individuals. On other occasions, entirely peaceful rallies and demonstrations grow into skirmishes with the police. Then we see a wave of mutual accusations, a search for the instigators... Appeals abound in local newspapers for the population not to give in to provocation, to stay calm, avoid being manipulated by the leaders of informal groups. Semilegal publications, on the other hand, accuse the authorities and police of everything. They view every skirmish as a provocation on their part.

All of this might have seemed like a bad dream... But reality sometimes turns out to be more frightening than dreams. Imagine it is night and a crowd of many thousands of people is in front of the Lvov city police station demanding that the next "prisoner of conscience" be released. Then special MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] detachments arrive on the scene. A cry, moans, blood on the cobblestones... And then press reports about victims on this and that side. The victims in such situations—as the bitter Tbilisi experience has shown—are primarily women and children, not the instigators, the organizers of the disturbances. They are random passers-by, people in the street...

On the next day the investigation begins. Public and prosecutor's commissions are established; telegrams stream into the USSR Supreme Soviet. All demand that the guilty parties be punished—but where it is found to be most convenient. Like the anecdote about the poor devil who loses his money in a dark alley and goes looking for it under the street light. It is brighter there.

Meanwhile, the tension is increasing. Strike committees are being established at enterprises. A general Lvov citywide committee has already been established. A 2-hour warning strike was conducted and we see the real threat of a more prolonged one. In short, the situation is gradually slipping out of the control of those who are responsible for it.

This is how the overall picture looks in its two-dimensional form. And everybody is asking—what are they doing in Lvov? Always such reasonable, cultured people, suddenly they have dashed out into dangerous adventures, gone to hell. Beyond this is...the abyss.

I must note that, with rare exceptions, the Lvov informal group movement has no place for manifestations of nationalism or interethnic strife. We see something different—an inclination toward ethnic rebirth. And this is not just a legal process—it is only natural as well. Failure to understand or accept it would constitute a refusal to acknowledge the deep-seated causes of today's tension.

The world of informal groups in the Lvov area is large and mixed. Each association has its own policy goals and tasks, its own work methods. But if we carefully examine the mosaic of their declarations, we see everywhere the same pivotal concept: The Ukrainian people are being called upon to fight for their right to develop their ethnic culture and language, to preserve their originality. And this idea is gathering many people under its banner, regardless of whether they belong to formal or informal organizations. One thing is characteristic of them: Nowhere—not at rallies (unless you count isolated, extremist escapades) nor in their publications do you see the idea propagated by the informals that this ethnic rebirth will take place at the expense of the rights of other peoples residing in the republic. Not a single informal organization has adopted as its armament a slogan of the variety "Down with migrants," "Ukraine for the Ukrainians," etc.

Enough is written these days in the central press, and republic press as well, regarding the most powerful social association, the People's Movement of the Ukraine for Perestroyka (Rukh). This group is accused of all the grave sins—from inflaming interethnic dissension to attempts to seize power in the republic. And for some reason no one has analyzed the sense of the documents adopted at the Rukh constituent congress. Even if one were to examine them under a microscope, he would find no attack on Leninist concepts of internationalism and the brotherhood of peoples. On the contrary, Rukh has declared its complete support of the national rebirth of all peoples residing in the republic and, with regard to the Jewish people, it has even adopted a special resolution condemning anti-Semitism.

Why am I talking about this? Because for many months now, strident official propaganda in Lvov Oblast and many other oblasts of the Ukraine has been directed exclusively against the informals in general, and against Rukh in particular. But here we see something strange—this distinct application of ideological pressure tactics leads to exactly opposite results. The prestige of the informals grows, their numbers increase; at the same time, party committees lose more and more of their influence, lose their popular base. Dialogue is replaced by confrontation and, in its extreme manifestation, the use of special MVD detachments.

Are the informals really all that frightening? This author recently conducted a "roundtable" discussion at a SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA correspondent's office. Leaders of Lvov informal organizations and responsible officials of the party obkom [oblast party committee], gorkom [city party committee], and gorispolkom [city executive committee] were invited. We formulated the day's agenda in this manner: "The Informals and the Authority: Confrontation or Cooperation?" After 5 hours of discussion, everyone came to the conclusion that no one needs confrontation of that sort, that we must all work together toward perestroyka. Alas, only now are some party workers coming to realize this simple truth. Others, the greater percentage, will not accept this, as before. And this comes at a time when, if the train has not left definitively, in any case you can now barely discern the lights on the last car.

I became convinced of this while at the last plenum of the party's oblast committee, where the Lvov situation was discussed. Here I was counting on being able to hear constructive proposals on the restructuring of ideological work of party organizations, on delegating the best, most authoritative communists to work within the informal organizations, on cooperation and the search for a proper resolution.... Alas, some who spoke bemoaned their helplessness, others flexed their muscles, and all together heaped abuse upon the informals that had overstepped their bounds and, naturally, on the press. One got the impression that, were it not for the informals and the press, perestroyka would be long since complete in the Lvov area and they would long since have reported back on it to the Central Committee.

Obkom members spent several consecutive hours trying to shed light on a simple question—just who gave the order to use truncheons against the crowd? And although all the highest-ranking officials of law enforcement organs were present at the plenum, the question never received a response. And this is not the first time! There is nothing to be amazed at here—decisions regarding such actions are made in secret and not at all by those whom the law prescribes to do so. Suffice it to say that gorispolkom chairman Bogdan Dmitriyevich Kotik found out about the bloody beatings only the morning of the next day, near the city police headquarters. I would like to see the American sheriff who would use military force against citizens without orders from the mayor!

And, by the way, who else was reviled at the plenum? That very same gorispolkom chairman, B. Kotik, and V. Volkov, the party gorkom first secretary. For what? Extremism? Intolerance? No, of course not. For trying to enter into a dialogue with Lvov citizens, allowing themselves to take part in rallies—even unsanctioned rallies—and, some believe, for earning political capital on this account. Volkov caught it particularly hard. He had hardly managed to engage in discussion with the leaders of a number of informal organizations, having invited them to the gorkom for this purpose, when one republic newspaper immediately accused him of soiling his white party clothes—it being unfitting for a secretary to have contact with all these shady characters. True, the newspaper failed to mention what would be fitting.

Turning now to political capital—yes, communists Kotik and Volkov are earning political capital. They are earning it for the party. Something else is strange—the fact that a certain portion of Lvov's leading communists will not accept this capital. A loss of capital suits them fine. It is not clear how these people intend to approach coming elections to the local soviets. Can they calmly discuss the fact that informals are straining for power and then do nothing in the political sphere? Can they preserve for the party, in this manner, its political stock in the local soviets? No one gets tired of asserting that perestroyka is a genuine revolution—but people seldom remember that the most important factor in effecting a revolution is winning over the popular masses.

In short, our ideological artillery is presently firing basically on friendly forces. Thus, a proposal was introduced at the plenum (without opposition) that an insert of some kind be drawn up for each party member's personal file where materials would be entered characterizing him in the era of perestroyka. The idea is, quite frankly, not a new one. Something similar was in use in ancient Rome, but there the inserts were termed somewhat differently—proscriptions. But we are not concerned with historical parallels—rather with whom you consider a production worker of perestroyka and whom its enemy. Who should compose these proscriptions? I have gotten the impression that the production worker of perestroyka can be the person who quietly sits out the time allotted for revolution in the bushes. Whereas the person who gets his white clothes frayed in heavy skirmishes with the ideological enemy becomes an antihero—with all the consequences ensuing therefrom.

This is how the Lvov novelty looks in party construction.

How many articles and monographs have been written on the vanguard role of the party and its committees in the local areas! What do we write about now? We are compelled to state that many committees are losing this role, raising "tailism" to the level of their policies. Why? Because firmly established stereotypes of thinking do not readily give way to destruction. The flow of fresh blood into the ideological aktiv of the party is proceeding too slowly. And it is a curious thing that the official ideologists of many party committees, suffering one defeat after another, in no way cast any uncertainty on their professional suitability.

For practically 10 years now I have seen the same people in that ideological section of the Lvov Party Obkom. Sometimes they are transferred from one job position to another. But their work style does not change. They are all excellent fellows and experienced apparatchiks, as it is said. But as far as getting out among the people or publishing a newspaper article that the entire city would be talking about—that just does not happen. Educated and organized during the stagnation era, they try to do everything "correctly" and are on time with their paperwork, but when it comes to evaluating and predicting situations in our rapidly changing world—this is just not their domain. Other people are needed here.

Meanwhile, tension in the Lvov area continues to grow and, directly proportional to it, the confusion in the midst of party leaders. What do you do?

It is inappropriate, of course, for a journalist to butt into areas with solutions to problems over which high-browed theoreticians have broken dozens of spears. All the same, I would like to say that if you don't know what position to take up in the column of perestroyka, avoid crafty philosophizing and simply go to the people. Be together with your people.

Demands for Removal of Kharkov Monument Ignored

PM0811102589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Own correspondent A. Kleva report: "Sign of Sorrow and Purification"]

[Text] Kharkov—On 4 November Kharkov's informal associations held a remembrance service for the victims of the repressions of the 1930's and 1940's and erected a cross on the site where they are buried (now the Park of Leisure).

The appearance of this symbol of suffering has aroused many differing opinions and discussions in the city. Above all because representatives of the city authorities demanded that the cross be removed. Such instructions were issued to emergency service and park worker collectives, and finally to fire-fighting units and militia departments.

Yes, the cross was erected unofficially, through the efforts of a small action group. But it was not removed. Everyone who refused to carry out the instructions had the same explanation: The party city committee, the city soviet, the rayon party committees, the rayon soviet executive committees, and the city's trade unions have been planning to commemorate the victims of the repressions and famine in the Ukraine for too long. Not only a memorial but a monument could have been erected long ago, and a citywide day of commemoration for those who died from repression and famine could have been held in the park. This was not done... And now there is a home-made monument.

New Body on Consequences of Chernobyl Founded

PM0911114389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Special correspondent V. Zaykin report: "'Chernobyl' Union Unites Those Who Are Not Indifferent"]

[Text] Kiev—The All-Union Conference of Participants in Eliminating the Aftermath of the Accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station [AES] has been held in Kiev. What made people from 30 of the country's cities travel to the Ukrainian capital?

More than 600,000 people have already passed through the crucible of Chernobyl. Many of those who worked for a long time under conditions hazardous to health need help today.

It is no coincidence that under these conditions a movement of participants in eliminating the aftermath of the accident has begun to come spontaneously into being from below. The Chernobyl AES Veterans Council raised the question of setting up under the All-Union Scientific Center of Radiation Medicine an expert council to establish the causal link between illnesses and disability and the effects of ionizing radiation. The Moscow "Chernobyl" Union (IZVESTIYA referred to it in issue No 303) tackles questions of social and legal protection both for participants in eliminating the aftermath of the accident and for persons living in the contaminated territories. It also independently monitors the radiation situation at nuclear installations. The Kharkov association gives material assistance to those who worked in the "zone." The Estonian Council of Ministers has assisted the republic Chernobyl Committee. I could continue with examples.

To establish businesslike contacts, exchange experience, and channel uncoordinated trends in the same direction—these are the aims which the representatives of various organizations brought to the conference. The coordinating council formed at the forum was entrusted with liaising among organizations and, at the same time, preparing for a congress of participants in eliminating the aftermath of the accident. It will be held at the end of April 1990—the 4th anniversary of the Chernobyl disaster.

"We have seen that our movement is on a large scale and is capable of giving real assistance to those who need it," S. Voloshchuk, vice president of the Moscow "Chernobyl" Union, said. "Talks have already been held with public organizations in the FRG, Italy, Spain, the United States, and Finland on cooperation in questions of diagnosing, treating, and preventing illnesses connected with the effects of radiation."

Secretary Girenko Visits Moscow Plant 2 Nov

PM0611122389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report on CPSU Central Committee Secretary A.N. Girenko 2 November visit to the "Krasnyy Proletariy" plant under general heading: "Encounters in Moscow's Labor Collectives"]

[Text]

With Faith in the Success of Perestroyka

The difficult problems which our country has to resolve in the course of perestroyka and the concerns and needs of the multimillion-strong working class are mirrored in the daily life of Moscow's "Krasnyy Proletariy" plant, one of the oldest in the capital. A.N. Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, visited the plant 2 November.

This visit was not at all like the encounters between party leaders and labor collectives that were popular in the not so distant past which followed a preplanned scenario and included set speeches. A.N. Girenko spent the whole day at the "Krasnyy Proletariy" plant, familiarizing himself in depth with the production process and inquiring about the solution of social and consumer issues down to the smallest detail.

The participants in a conversation which began in the office of the plant's general director, Yu.I. Kirilov, and later continued in the shops and construction areas paid special attention to the modernization of the enterprise, which recently marked its 130th anniversary. It is hard to believe but the ultramodern output of the plant's workers—lathes with digital program control—is produced in the cramped, ramshackle, and soot-blackened buildings dating back to before the revolution. The construction of new production premises was planned long ago but the plant workers' plans have still not been implemented because...they clashed with the wishes of the residents of the capital's Oktyabrskiy Rayon. The latter objected among other things to the construction of standard plant buildings alongside an architectural monument—the Donskoy monastery. A heated debate flared up today on ways to resolve the protracted conflict between construction workers and the lovers of antiquity near the already dug foundation pit where what is essentially a new automated plant is to be built. Compromise solutions satisfying the sides involved must be found and implemented in the very near future, A.N. Girenko stressed.

Another equally acute construction problem at the plant is that of housing. There has been a waiting list for apartments for years and there is no end in sight to it. It is true, though, that the Krasnyy Proletariy workers have been promised a part of the 22-story block that is being built in Lyublinskiy Rayon—in exchange for a pledge to carry out decoration work there. However, judging by appearances, this will only slightly alleviate the situation. The machine tool builders submitted a petition to the CPSU Central Committee secretary requesting that a plot of land be allocated to the plant for the construction of a residential block using the direct labor method.

In the assembly shop the conversation centered on a new problem encountered by the plant in recent years—cadre turnover. Many skilled workers are leaving to join cooperatives, lured away by higher pay and better working conditions.

"Do not hinder the development of cooperative production, enter into healthy competition with it," A.N. Girenko said in this regard. "'Smarten up' the social sphere and achieve higher qualitative indicators than the cooperative workers and you will retain your best cadres."

At a subsidiary of the plant at the other end of town the visitor was familiarized with examples of long-term output—processing centers and robot equipment. A.N. Girenko supported the Krasnyy Proletariy workers' desire to develop cooperation with leading foreign firms (for example, with the West German company EMAG), which will accelerate the process of creating highly efficient equipment capable of competing in the world market. The intention of Moscow machine builders to increase production and expand the range of consumer goods deserves every support, he noted.

Giving your TASS correspondent his impressions of the visit to the plant, A.N. Girenko said among other things:

"The Krasnyy Proletariy workers' belief in the success of perestroyka and their conviction that the considerable difficulties and obstacles in the way of the economic reform will eventually be overcome is heartening. The open and honest dialogue with working people concerned not only for their own narrow production problems but also for everything to do with our country's life—be it the forthcoming elections to the local soviets or ways to eliminate interethnic conflicts—was truly satisfying."

Secretary Manayenkov Visits Steel Plant

PM0611115989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report on CPSU Central Committee Secretary Yu.A. Manayenkov's 2 November visit to "Serp i Molot" plant under general heading "Encounters in Moscow's Labor Collectives"]

[Text]

Dialogue with Metallurgists

Since his time at the Lipetsk Magnitka CPSU Central Committee Secretary Yu.A. Manayenkov has had a special relationship with the metal worker's profession. Therefore his 2 November visit to the Moscow "Serp i Molot" metallurgical plant was interpreted at the enterprise as a token of live, natural interest in the people working in this sector.

Acquaintance with the collective began in the electrical shaped-castings shop. Its "core" is a continuous steel teeming installation. Metal casting was in progress when the CPSU Central Committee secretary arrived. When the process was completed, he inquired about work progress and working and living conditions. It could be said that the plant originated in this shop and the glorious traditions of those far-off times are kept sacred here. This is borne out by one detail alone: The shop's collective has pledged to fulfill the annual plan ahead of schedule by 20 December. It plans to produce 1,000 tonnes of castings in excess of the targets.

So there are labor successes, but what are people's working conditions like? Much time was spent on touring the shop's facilities where people can recuperate during breaks or after the shift and spend their leisure meaningfully. Yu.A. Manayenkov acquainted himself with the shop's medical station and recreation center, which includes a mental relaxation room and a sauna, not to mention showers. All this, and also a red study room, a chess room, and a shop sports complex have been built by the workers and specialists themselves.

It emerged in conversations with people that the CPSU Central Committee secretary had by no means come to visit the plant to dispense instructions, or worse still, to lecture the workers. However, it did not pass without advice being given where appropriate, but it was offered rather than thrust on people. When the question of training and—in current conditions even more important—retraining of metallurgical cadres arose in the training office, he noted: "One of the weak points in production is precisely that we do not train people well enough."

Perestroyka insistently demands enhanced skills, and this does not apply to metal workers alone, of course. One of the reasons which makes this necessary is that our collectives are entering into broad international contacts. A convincing example in this respect was cited by S.V. Kolpakov, USSR minister of metallurgy. I have just had a visit, he said, from representatives of a Finnish company with whom we are negotiating the establishment of a joint venture. They told us frankly: We will supply world-standard technology and specialists of the same quality. And they intimated: Will this be the case also on the Soviet side?

Yu.A. Manayenkov spent a long time in the section rolling shop. It is a new shop, only 5 years old. The term "high-precision work" does not seem very apt in relation to the metal worker's profession. However, in the context of this shop it is absolutely correct. Blanks for the production of wire and metal calibrations within a range of 4 to 40 millimeters are produced here. This work could not be carried out without the new semi-automatic rolling mill which replaced two old ones that involved a great deal of manual labor. "Are there any problems?"—the Central Committee secretary inquired. The most painful problem is that the shop frequently fails to fulfill the plan for deliveries. It emerged that this is not its own fault, merely a common trouble in the sector. The shop is let down by other suppliers, which leads to production disruptions which spread like a chain reaction. The enterprise uses only 10 percent of its own metal, while 90 percent comes in from outside, from 15 other suppliers. Frequently the supplied metal has defects which have to be "scrubbed" and that is a thankless labor. Is that perhaps not a problem?

It is not difficult to notice that the CPSU Central Committee secretary's thoughts constantly return to people, to the way they live, to what the plant is doing to ease their daily life. And, as if implicitly understanding this special interest, the workers with whom Yu.A. Manayenkov converses refer above all to their leaders' personal qualities. Well, that too is the result of the newness of the processes which are under way in the country. One of the women workers replied to a question about the shop manager: We could not have anyone better, "no one has ever taken such good care of us before."

The CPSU Central Committee secretary, who knows—and not from hearsay—in what difficult conditions metallurgical workers have to work, could not but ask the following question: What is the situation like at the plant as regards the ecological situation? But everything is in order here in this sphere. N.Ya. Izvekov, the enterprise director, and M.I. Pryakhin, the party committee secretary, explain that in this respect their plant is now being used as an example whereas a few years ago it was constantly criticized. The plant's territory is covered by a powerful installation which filters around 5,000 tonnes of polluted atmosphere per day.

During the familiarization with the work of the shops, tasks in stepping up production and enhancing output quality were discussed in detail and there was a lively and committed exchange of opinions on ways to improve management. The importance of improving the housing conditions of workers and specialists was emphasized. Much attention was devoted to questions of improving the forms and methods of party work.

Pugo Visits Moscow Aircraft Complex

PM0711163189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
4 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Meetings With the Capital's Labor Collectives"]

[Text] Kalininskiy Rayon, one of the capital's smallest rayons in terms of industrial potential, is rightly considered one of the most advanced. B.K. Pugo, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, visited the rayon or rather the A.N. Tupolev Aviation scientific and technical complex, which is situated on its territory.

The visit to the complex began with a conversation with general designer A.A. Tupolev. Then the CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member visited the aircraft prototype shop, the design department, the automatic computer center, and the production premises. In the shop B.K. Pugo had a conversation with milling machine operator A.A. Kulagin, a veteran of the complex, who talked about the problems troubling workers and their working and living conditions. For example, young people do not like the low pay (average wages for the complex' workers is R225) and many are leaving to join cooperatives. There is also a problem with housing and vegetable plots. More than 1,600 people, or one-tenth of the complex' workers, would like to have vegetable plots. In this connection B.K. Pugo asked how workers would react if the state began selling vegetable plots to all who wanted one. In A.A. Kulagin's opinion, this is a good idea although much would depend on the price, of course.

Conversion. This word became a firm part of our vocabulary just 2 or 3 years ago. Unlike many enterprises they began developing new types of consumer goods here back in 1983. And the designers have something to show for it. The "375" trailer—a house on wheels enabling the owner to enjoy the comfort of his city apartment while on a trip—is generating undoubted interest. However, nothing has come of the model handed over to the manufacturing plant. In 5 years just 200 have been produced although thousands of people would like one. Matters are faring no better with the production of the AL 550 aluminum microclass yacht. Even though Japan, one of the leading boatbuilding nations, has shown great interest in it and has already bought 15 yachts. Incidentally, this is the first time that Japan has bought our boats in the past 100 years. The Americans are also ready to buy a consignment of lightweight sailboats.

The Party Control Committee chairman's visit to the complex ended with a meeting with party committee members. There was a frank, businesslike discussion on the most diverse aspects of the life of the party and society. Communists' speeches were not like victory reports listing successes achieved. A.V. Rudakov, first secretary of the Kalininskiy party rayon committee, and V.D. Zharov, secretary of the complex' party committee, talked about the work of the rayon's Communists primarily with regard to the solution of social questions and local problems. The complex' leading specialists expressed concern at the aircraft servicing backlog. The facilities and space for servicing aircraft are often lacking.

Winding up the conversation with party committee members, B.K. Pugo said that in his opinion it had been meaningful and useful. The times in which we are living, the speaker noted, are exceptionally interesting and complex. Perestroyka has entered a decisive stage. The complexity of the moment lies in the fact that it has begun to directly affect people's interests. The vast majority support perestroyka but negative views are being expressed, too. The most important thing, however, is that perestroyka is underway and deep changes are in progress. That is indicated by the activity of the new USSR Supreme Soviet. For example, the past week in parliament demonstrated deputies' high sense of responsibility. You will agree, after all, that it is one thing to discuss and criticize in general terms but quite another to really tackle major state problems.

There is much work to be done in the economy. The priority task is to normalize the monetary and financial system. Much work is needed from labor collectives to increase the production of consumer goods, make more efficient use of material, labor, and financial resources, and create modern equipment. Ultimately this is the only basis on which the urgent social demands can be satisfied and the resources found for raising Soviet people's living standard. On the conversion of military production, the speaker noted that on the whole its progress is slow. The interests of the country and our national economy demand that the solution of this complex problem be accelerated.

B.K. Pugo also touched on questions of interethnic relations and noted the importance of the platform "The Party's Nationalities Policy in Present-Day Conditions" which was adopted at the CPSU Central Committee September (1989) Plenum. It was stressed that the party's policy is aimed at the acquisition of real sovereignty by all the union republics, including the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member noted that during the years of Soviet power an integrated national economic complex has been formed in the country. Economically, politically, and spiritually, all the Soviet republics are closely interlinked, and this is the objective reality of our life. At the same time the party does not underestimate the danger of nationalist manifestations and does not dismiss them as it consolidates all of society's forces for the solution of the tasks of developing and strengthening our federation.

The CPSU is actively struggling for the renewal of our society and of itself. In the debates on the party's role and place in the political system and the forms and methods of exercising its vanguard role, very awkward questions are often raised. However all the rational and reasonable comments and everything which benefits perestroyka, democratization, and glasnost must be adopted without fail. The most important thing, I think, B.K. Pugo said, is that the party should constantly assert itself as the Soviet people's true vanguard not in words but in actual deeds.

All inner political life must also become more democratic, varied, and meaningful. It is particularly important now that those who enter the party do so from conviction. The CPSU needs real communists, B.K. Pugo stressed.

Razumovskiy Talks to Workers at Plastics Plant

LD0311014789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 2 Nov 89

[Text] Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo and CPSU Central Committee secretary, today visited the Plastic Scientific Production Association. His main interest was people's attitude toward progress in restructuring, not in general, but through their living and working conditions, through the way they themselves felt in the climate of political and economic reform.

The Central Committee secretary's conversations on this subject with people in the workshops, as well as a discussion on the issue, were attended by representatives of the general management of the Scientific Production Association, the Council of Labor Collectives, the party organization, the trade union organization, workshop managers, engineering and technical staff, and ordinary workers. On a number of questions, the Central Committee secretary did not supply ready answers; he invited reflection. In the lively discussion, in the comparison of opinions and points of view, the following thought could be clearly traced: following the course of perestroyka, one must train oneself to make independent decisions and to assume full responsibility for them without being afraid of the trial and error, without which no new venture is possible.

[Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 2 November, as part of its "Vremya" newscast, reports that "Comrades Razumovskiy, Yazov, Baklanov, Girenko, Manayenkov, Stroyev, and Usmanov today visited Moscow enterprises." The television report provides no further details]

IZVESTIYA Account of Visit

PM0611095989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report on P.G. Razumovskiy 2 November visit to Moscow Plastik Science and Production Association under general heading: "Encounters in Moscow's Labor Collectives"]

[Excerpts]

Who Dares, Wins

Every collective is a cross-section of society, as it were, reflecting the features which characterize that society's life. Moscow's Plastik Science and Production Association, to which G.P. Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, paid a visit 2 November, is no exception. His interest focused on people's attitude to the progress of perestroyka. Not their attitude in general terms, but their attitude based on their living and working conditions and on how they themselves feel in the climate of political and economic reform. [passage omitted]

The life of the Plastik collective is marked by quest and struggle. This also applies to its party organization. What are its place and role in the present conditions? What should the social formations within the science and production association be doing now and how? Will there still be a need for a labor collective council when the association switches to leasing? The Central Committee secretary, who took part in this discussion, refrained from giving cut-and-dried answers to a number of questions. He invited people to think. In the course of a keen discussion and juxtaposition of opinions and viewpoints the thought crystalized: In pursuing the course of perestroyka, it is necessary to learn to take independent decisions and accept full responsibility for them without being afraid of trial and error. No new venture is possible without this. Not for nothing it is said: Who dares, wins.

PRAVDA Account

PM0711132489 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[A. Petrushov report under general heading: "Meetings With Capital's Labor Collectives"]

[Text] When I asked Georgiy Petrovich Razumovskiy about the purpose of his visit to the Plastik Science and Production Association, he smiled and replied: "Do not look for an ulterior motive. It is all very simple. Each collective is a microcosm of society. You can check out many things on the basis of a collective. That is why I wanted to talk to workers and engineers and hear their opinion on the course of perestroyka, what they say not at big meetings but among their comrades, what they think about, how they live."

G.P. Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was keen to make people's acquaintance and quickly found a common language with them. He asked about their work and life, especially stressing questions related to working and living conditions, and asked about their feelings and mood. The workers in turn were eager to talk.

In the consumer goods shop, for instance, there was a discussion of what people are actually getting out of perestroyka. In the workers' opinion, there have been changes, marked changes. Plant veteran Ivan Mikhaylovich Gushchin suggested that they inspect the shop. He has been working here for 35 years. He remembers well how people used to go about the shop in gumboots. Now everything is clean and well ordered. To all intents and purposes, he said proudly, there are no hazardous production processes here now.

Here is another example. In the flexible hose section in the molding shop, the workers stated: "The most important thing is that we feel we are in charge." Nearly a year ago, the shop collective switched to leasing. Since then, there has been a real leap forward. And earnings have begun to increase.

Of course, the plant workers pointed out their museum and their production range display. A meeting with representatives of the general management was held in the afternoon in the conference hall. Members of the labor collective council, party and trade union organization activists, shop leaders, scientists, and specialists were also present.

Throughout the discussion, the participants expressed the idea that today our society is capable of implementing the proposals and ideas which the party has put forward. A convincing example of that is provided by the science and production association—the chief organization in the plastics production sector. It includes the all-union scientific research and industrial design institute, the Dorogomilovskiy Chemical Plant, and the Zagorskiy Experimental Plastics Plant. In its introduction of economic management methods, the science and production association has already tried out both models of economic accountability—the first and second—and has wholeheartedly, without fear or hesitation, aimed for a higher level of independence. As of 1 January next year the collective switches to full leasing.

Deputy General Director Viktor Vasilyevich Obukhov stressed that the collective as a whole is prepared for work in the new fashion. Before taking the decisive step, they tested all the advantages and disadvantages of leasing in the molding shop. Everyone is satisfied: the workers, the engineers, and the scientists. The intraproduction cooperative created 1 year ago proved a good schooling in economic management. Some 1,200 people now work there as well as performing their main job. This secondary employment gives the enterprise and thus the state additional output worth R5 million. The cooperative has quite a lot of spare cash in its account, as it were, a reserve for the future.

In brief, economic reform questions at the Plastik Association have now entered the realm of real practical solutions. There has been a major change in people's mood. They have become more resourceful and enterprising.

All of this has been quick to affect general indicators. The renewal of production has quickened considerably. Output quality has improved. The export market for output has expanded. The participants in the meeting also talked about the start of changes in the social sphere. Everyday service premises are being updated in all the shops and new ones are being built. The kindergarten problem has been solved. A health complex is being built in the Moscow region and a start has been made on the construction of three apartment blocks, which is particularly pleasing to the plant's workers.

Of course, the association still has quite a few problems. The collective is alarmed at the slow pace of development of scientific and technical progress. First Deputy General Director Vsevolod Vasilyevich Abramov and other specialists spoke frankly about that.

Of course, the meeting also discussed perestroyka in the party, the role and significance of primary party organizations, and the increasing of their militancy. One collective member in five is a Communist and there are 22 shop organizations. But Party Committee Secretary Aleksey Alekseyevich Volkov made no secret of the fact that eight people have left the CPSU this year.

"Plant party members," he said, "believe that no one should be forced to stay in the party. However, there should be no letup in work to recruit honest and thoughtful people to the CPSU. Six people have already joined the party at our plant and a number of other applications are being considered. The essence of the party's renewal consists not only in the improvement of forms and methods. The most important thing is the recruitment of real supporters of perestroyka. As a rule, party meetings in shop organizations involve the entire collective. Even so," A. Volkov admitted, "we still aren't doing enough work at grassroots level."

The meeting also discussed questions of mutual relations between the party committee and trade union, All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League, and social organizations and the labor collective council. Even though there is no particular tension here a number of aspects cropped up and the Central Committee secretary took part in the consideration of them.

Before Georgiy Petrovich left, I asked him for his impressions. Here are some of his comments: "I liked the atmosphere in the collective. It is calm, businesslike, and creative. A very important point is that the leadership's actions are neither hasty nor too cautious. Everything is being done in a well considered way together with the collective. And that, clearly, is the right path. Take the lease, for instance. People have consciously accepted it and it now has its own momentum, as it were, it needs no prompting. As for the party organization, as I see it, the Communists clearly understand the situation and know how to solve problems. But, of course, the Central Committee's request for extra work and a more active, firm, and principled stance applies to each of the association's Communists too."

Zaykov Visits Motor Vehicle Plant

PM0211163589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Work Better—Live Better"]

[Text] Perestroyka's success depends not on loud talk but on real progress in the economy. The labor capital is getting ready to greet the October holiday in this mood.

This was discussed 31 October during a visit by L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU City Committee, to the Lenin Komsomol Motor Vehicle Plant.

It was noted that modernization and a switch to a new vehicle model are in full swing at the Lenin Komsomol Motor Vehicle Plant. This is complex work, but the collective sees the way out primarily in accelerating technical progress and improving workers' labor and living conditions.

At meetings with the plant's party-economic aktiv and with the Lyublinskiy Rayon party organization aktiv it was stressed that it is necessary to do everything to accelerate perestroyka, consolidate society's forces, and solve the problems which have emerged. First and foremost, the speakers said, it is necessary to strengthen discipline and order, combat poor management, and vigorously solve social questions.

Congratulating those assembled on their holiday, L.N. Zaykov wished them success and noted that today the result of the revolutionary renewal started by the party depends on us. Perestroyka is the continuation of October and the rebirth of the Leninist form of socialism.

Zaykov Visits Milk Processing Plant

LD0211104489

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 1 November carries a 3-minute "Vremya" video report by P. Orlov, entitled "The Obstacles in the Milk River." Orlov, reporting from the Lianozovskiy milk processing combine following its being supplied with modern equipment by the Swedish Alfa-Laval company, says that despite massive investment in rubles and time, production in still lagging behind expectations. The acompanying video shows automated equipment, a control room equipped with computer terminals and computers, followed by a shot of a meeting between plant officials and Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Vladilen Valentinovich Nikitin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Zaykov says: "We invested R40 million, but so far one cannot see any return. Everyone seems to be just walking around; there is complete confusion."

Orlov says that the Swedish company has fulfilled its obligations and adds that the plant is working at a loss after a year in operation, but it should be at the stage of guaranteeing sufficient milk supplies for the city. The video shows Zaykov touring the plant and talking with workers. Zaykov is heard to say: "Why did this happen? Why was an attempt made to adapt foreign technology to our, to put in mildly, errors and shortcomings, while the reverse action should have been taken?"

Orlov concludes his report by noting that all that could be resolved today by bring together leaders and specialists has been done, and possible administrative measures have been announced. The accompanying video shows Zaykov talking with plant officials.

Urges Improvements

PM0311152789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Living up to People's Expectations"]

[Text] The question alluded to in the headline has always been not only economic but political, too. Now it has become equally economic and political, because the capacities of the Lianozovskiy Dairy Combine in Moscow are not being assimilated satisfactorily, despite the adoption of a series of measures.

L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU City Committee [gorkom], visited the combine 1 November. Let us say right away that he stressed at the meeting with the collective that the backlog at the enterprise caused by sluggishness, poor work, and irresponsibility cannot be tolerated any longer.

Let us note that the date chosen for the visit was no accident. By that date it was clear that the collective leaders' promises are not going to be kept and the fulfillment of the production program for this year, and indeed next year, is under threat. So that the concern of city organizations for the fate of the plans adopted and the urgency of the conversation which took place is fully understood, we will dwell briefly on the combine's history—it will help to show why such unfavorable results have been achieved here.

The commissioning of an enterprise for the processing of 1,000 tonnes of whole milk produce per shift was included in the state account in 1988. At the time of acceptance more than half of the installation and commissioning work had not been completed; production of milk, sour cream, cottage cheese, kefir, fermented boiled milk, and sour milk products had not begun; and the automated equipment system included in the plan was not operational. By the beginning of June this year only 1 out of 25 manufacturing lines using imported equipment had been commissioned, producing around 2,000 tonnes of milk, but even then there were disruptions. At a session of the presidium of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Control and Audit Commission in June, Communists in charge of the "Moloko" Association, to which the combine belongs, and of the Moscow Agroindustrial Committee gave assurances that by 1 November resolute measures would be taken to ensure the planned assimilation of capacities.

Now the time has come to keep that promise. It may be said that every Moscow family demanded. The time has come to live up to people's expectations. That is what L.N. Zaykov said when opening a conference after a thorough familiarization with the state of affairs in the shops themselves.

What emerged from the comprehensive discussion of the problems, a number of which may without exaggeration be called intractable? First and foremost, the fact that the leadership of the association and the combine have by no means made use of all their potential.

At the end of September the "Moloko" and "Selkhozpromeksport" associations received from the Swedish firm Alfa-Laval equipment fully tuned for production and equipped for automated work. At the same time, the leadership of the combine was strengthened and V.A. Tambov, an experienced engineer, took charge of the collective. Nevertheless, the production target for the first 9 months was not met. There is still cause for alarm.

Now they are analyzing the situation and the reasons why the combine found itself in this unenviable position. All the sides involved in the solution of the problem are voicing their opinions. And it turns out that the decisions to staff the combine with cadres of workers, chiefly specialists and primarily electronic engineers for the operation of the automated production control systems, are not being fulfilled. The total shortage now amounts to more than 500 people. The question of providing the enterprise with the required amount of containers and spare parts has not been resolved. Furthermore, when the equipment was being operated, serious flaws were discovered in the documentation of the "Gipromyasomolprom" Institute, as were construction faults and defects in the installation work of the "Soyuzmyasomolmontazh" trust. Equipping a site would seem to be a simple matter, but the "Mosstroy-20" trust even made a hash of that.

Everyone agrees that cadres are the main problem. That is the factor which, if dealt with, can remedy matters fundamentally. That isn't only the Soviet side's opinion. That is the view of the Swedish engineers who are contracted to debug the equipment and train Soviet specialists. During L.N. Zaykov's inspection of the main production control panel, they noted that the Soviet side has failed to provide trainees in those sections where they were planned. The enterprise's weak spot was glaringly obvious: There is a shortage of specialists and much time has been wasted resolving this problem.

Where are cadres of highly skilled specialists to be found right now, as a matter of urgency, so to speak? One way, speakers said, is by attracting those top-class engineers already in the association or at enterprises of other sectors, including defense workers. The Moscow City Soviet is meeting the collective halfway—it is allocating to 15 engineers in the disciplines in shortest supply 15 apartments, which it is ready to offer in the next few months.

As for material incentives, it must be borne in mind that the combine's leadership makes them directly dependent on the end product. If a shop fails to meet its commitments, its pay is based solely on the basic wage rates.

When discussing cadre problems, L.N. Zaykov drew the conference participants' attention to what was discussed 1 year ago. At that time, the enterprise leaders gave assurances that cadre questions would be tackled vigorously. But progress remains slow. This irresponsibility cannot be tolerated, the Moscow CPSU Gorkom first secretary stressed. We will call people strictly to account for the shortcomings according to the criteria of Party responsibility for the demands of perestroyka, he said.

If the combine had begun working to full capacity it would be unequalled in the world today. And when that does happen this city with its many millions of people will be almost fully supplied with dairy products. That is why when discussing measures to overcome the present situation the question was put in no uncertain terms: The enterprise must be staffed with cadres from the disciplines in shortest supply by 15 November. Both the Soviet and the Swedish sides stressed that no automatic equipment will work effectively or continuously unless it is manned by reliable, competent people.

It was agreed that immediately and without a day's delay the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee [gorispolkom] would examine the enterprise's work schedule literally quarter by quarter through 1991 with a view to achieving the design capacity of 2,000 tonnes of milk processed per day under a two-shift schedule. All the organizations involved will be set specific targets, with personal responsibility for each up to and including the leaders of the relevant departments.

It is well known that the manufacturing process at a combine begins with the receipt of the raw materials. Thus, the collective must campaign to increase profitability by ironing out the production problems and increasing labor productivity. The bonus of that is an additional reserve for the enterprise's fund to provide an incentive so that people have an interest in their work.

During the conference the following dialogue took place:

L.N. Zaykov: What target do you have to reach when the plant switches to full capacity—2,000 tonnes of milk processed a day?

Voice: Profit should be around R5.5 million.

L.N. Zaykov: What is profitability like now?

Voice: Minus R13 million at present.

L.N. Zaykov: Until you have resolved this question, there won't be real interest in the work and there won't be any produce in the stores. That is abundantly clear. R40 million in foreign currency have been spent on developing the enterprise. What has to be done to earn it and ensure that Muscovites have the full range of dairy produce which has been assigned to you?

Voice: That is a difficult question at the moment.

When discussing the questions that cropped up, L.N. Zaykov talked in detail about the work of a similar enterprise in Prague which he visited recently. They have an entirely self-contained production cycle there. He stressed that unless one is created, matters will constantly go wrong. Unless we resolve this problem now, we will have production disruptions in 1990 and subsequent years.

For the tried-and-tested electronic equipment to pay its way it needs the very best specialists because this is continuous production. Just like, for example, missile equipment in defense. There must be no disruption. A 100-percent guarantee—that is what is needed here. But we have commissioned a plant and cannot organize production. Measures are needed to ensure that work proceeds without disruption as of 1 January, beginning with the supply of raw materials and ending with the dispatch of produce to the stores.

It all now depends on us, L.N. Zaykov went on, because the plant has everything it needs. It has a full set of equipment and the trouble-shooting process is almost complete.

What has to be done, who must do what and when? The relevant document will be approved by the Moscow Gorispolkom. I have an urgent request of my own: You must begin with cadres. And with the Communists among those cadres. And all these questions must be monitored by the party gorkom, the Timiryazevskiy CPSU Rayon Committee, and the combine's party bureau.

The deadline which we have set ourselves, L.N. Zaykov went on to say, is also being monitored. We shall hold economic leaders accountable in the same way as Communists—with the utmost party rigorousness. The combine must be helped. Each individual will be personally responsible for the fulfillment of the decision adopted. We have no right to allow further disruptions.

V.V. Nikitin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases, assured the enterprise collective that the necessary help will be given by the USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Councils of Ministers. The problem of commissioning the combine's capacities must be resolved this year.

The idea of creating a Soviet-Swedish joint venture for the production of packaging and spare parts has been studied.

During the conference some local leaders recalled that Moscow's vocational and technical colleges are not providing enough workers for the combine at the moment. This problem can be resolved without much difficulty if efforts are made. But the problem is that the collective has grown used to parasitism and pins its hopes on outsiders coming in and solving its problem for it.

There was a keen discussion on the point that the combine has no real working link with transportation workers. The drivers who fetch the milk from the countryside are not responsible for the state in which it is delivered. The driver must also be responsible for the quality of the produce he accepts—that is the general opinion. It has been decided to lease a transportation enterprise.

A decision has been adopted to introduce state acceptance not at the end of the manufacturing process but when accepting the raw materials supplied to the combine.

The conference did not miss a single issue which slows down the work of the enterprise. Special attention was paid to questions connected with the production of baby food. The plant producing this output is experiencing certain difficulties. Soviet enterprises have still not organized the production of packaging. A solution has been found to those questions, too.

More on Komsomol Central Committee Plenum

Abalkin Addresses Commission

PM3010143389 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "On the Eve of Changes"]

[Excerpts]

At the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] Central Committee Bureau

A routine session of the Komsomol Central Committee Bureau has been held.

Questions of the Ninth Komsomol Central Committee Plenum were discussed. It was proposed to place on the plenum agenda the questions of the present moment, the convening of the 21st Komsomol Congress, the draft Statutes and Program Statement of the Komsomol Central Committee, and the All-Union Student Forum. [Passage omitted]

The Komsomol Central Committee Bureau session examined a number of other questions.

The Komsomol Central Committee permanent commissions and the Komsomol Central Auditing Commission worked 26 October. L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, participated in the session of the Commission for Young People's Socioeconomic Problems.

From the address of L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to members of the Commission for Young People's Socioeconomic Problems:

"What is most important now and where, in my view, the Komsomol can help is in shaping the new thinking of the new generation of people.

"What is being actively propagandized now is the model of the contemporary person without ideological blinders who argues approximately like this: 'It is important that I have an opportunity to earn and to buy what I want with my earnings. It does not concern me what society will be called.' I do not know whether we are deceiving ourselves or whether we are being manipulated very skillfully. The very attempt to say that no ideology is necessary and that we can do without it is also an ideology, you know.

"We are very short on state thinking and a state approach. I was recently looking through the materials of Supreme Soviet committees and commissions. They all advocate that there should be no deficit in the state budget or in outlay, but at the same time they ask for an additional allocation of R45 billion to implement various programs. It is not clear from whom this is to be taken. We have to learn to say no. To what end? For the sake of the national economy. For the sake of the economy's full functioning.

"And another point, since we are talking about 'earning.' Restructuring awareness means being able to think in concepts of modern economics, in concepts of efficiency, quality, and technical progress. Resolving, let us say, to overstep some limiters in a particular enterprise and say: I will do everything well and nothing badly. Let my volume decrease in terms of pieces or rubles, but I will not let anything leave the plant which will raise a contemptuous smile."

Mironenko Plenum Address

90UN0204A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Oct 89 pp 1, 2

[Speech by V. Mironenko, first secretary of the Central Committee of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League at its Ninth Plenum: "About the Current Situation"]

[Text] The Bureau of the Central Committee of the VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League, Komsomol], in considering questions for the forthcoming plenum and recalling our discussions at previous plenums, proposes to begin our work with a discussion of the current situation.

From our standpoint, this kind of talk is necessary.

First, in order to check assessments of the situation that has taken shape in the country, among the youth, and in the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] and, if it can be said this way, in order to put our discussion on a firm foundation. We would like very much that the members of the central electoral organs, in discussing questions on the current situation, not only state their attitudes toward the activity of the Central Committee of the Komsomol, but also share their ideas about the state of affairs in local Komsomol organizations.

I would ask you strongly not to interpret this information as some kind of a complete report. I would like to share some ideas, and afterwards invite members of the central electoral organs, including members of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Komsomol, to continue the discussion on the current situation.

What are our assessments of the situation in the country? During the time that has passed since the Eighth Plenum of the Central Committee of the Komsomol, the situation has not changed substantially, and the situation remains extremely tense. There continues to be an aggravation of the crisis processes in the economy, shortages are accelerating, and the disorganization of transportation has not been overcome. Members of the socioeconomic commission of the Central Committee of the Komsomol and many members of the central electoral organs met yesterday with Comrade L.I. Abalkin, and they discussed in detail our participation in the resolution of these problems.

A discussion is continuing in the political arena about the future of the country, about the role of the party, and about the possibilities for its renewal. A polarization of forces is taking place on the eve of the forthcoming elections to republic and local soviets of people's deputies. There is a sharpening of the perception of social injustice, a reaction to profiteering, to defects in the cooperative movement, and to social differentiation in our society. An especially striking and sharp polarization of forces has taken place in interethnic relations. On the one hand, there is a consolidation in the orientation of the party platform on the ethnic question after the CPSU Central Committee plenum and, on the other hand, there is the frequently dangerous political game in ethnic problems.

In recent months, the arrangement of forces in the youth movement of the country and the situation in the youth environment continued to change, and very dynamically. A stratification of the informal movement is taking place, claims to a monopoly representation of its interests, which were still being expressed rather prominently recently, are being demolished, and a polarization of views and a clear formulation of their positions is taking place. In this situation, a real opportunity opens up before us of a clear definition of one's supporters and one's political opponents. But, I think that we will talk about this during discussions of the Program Statement, which is submitted for our review.

There is an obvious need for a consolidation of healthy forces in the youth movement and a principled political discussion with those who orient themselves on nonsocialist and stagnant models of society regardless of the paths they propose—radical left or dogmatic. We have already discussed this with you at several plenums, and we firmly took the position of legal guarantees for youth structures that are ready to operate within the scope of the USSR Constitution, and within the framework of a socialist election. This is fundamental for us, for it is only under such a condition that the Committee of Youth Organizations can acquire a real legal status and that an opportunity may open up for the organizational registration and possible organizational administration of various youth structures. It should be a question of the legal formation of a qualitatively new all-union youth structure of cooperation, a search for a constructive platform for interaction, and the development of common approaches to various youth organizations of the country.

We are convinced that there is more that unites than disunites the young people of our country. But, unfortunately, the searches for that common element, that common platform on which we could decide, have been dragged out, and also dragged out, very likely, in various informal movements and in various youth associations. The Komsomol is ready, together with other youth associations, to begin the development of specific agreements and decisions which would facilitate making the Committee of Youth Organizations an effective and real operating structure and a consolidating basis for the youth movement of the country. In our opinion, it would be entirely possible to complete this work as early as this year.

Alarm was expressed during talks in the Bureau of the Komsomol Central Committee, very likely valid, over the still continuing attempt to replace the Komsomol and over prospects for transforming the Komsomol organization into a depoliticized and deideologized structure "according to interests."

Against a background of sharp discussions that play havoc at sessions of the Supreme Soviet, the dissatisfaction of the youth with the work of the people's deputies from the Komsomol is noticeable and tangible. Of course, let us agree that very likely not everything can be seen on television. We had a talk about this yesterday in the deputies group. But the Komsomol committees should also assume part of the blame. There is very poor utilization of the opportunity to state and resolve youth problems through our own deputies. The Komsomol Central Committee is also not the best example here. A request of the people's deputies to five departments of the Komsomol Central Committee to state their desires and proposals on the state plan and budget for 1990 was left practically unanswered. The Bureau of the Komsomol Central Committee, unfortunately, in large measure did not spot this tendency in work. There are no positions on principal questions that the deputies should discuss in the Supreme Soviet and its committees.

The process of forming a Committee on Youth Affairs is not moving as fast as the problems that disturb the youth are growing, and the responsibility for this is also shared by the Komsomol Central Committee. We have spoken more than once about the necessity to develop an integral concept of a state youth policy. Unfortunately, although work is being conducted, it is going very slowly. But the most unpleasant thing is that not only theoretical work in the development of a new policy, but also the advancement of certain of its elements, which are already apparent today, are being carried out in an extremely irresolute way. We are doing it, but somehow in a very slow and a very indecisive way.

The presentation of the draft Law on Youth to the Committee on Youth Affairs, with the participation of four other committees of the Supreme Soviet, showed that the attitude toward it, to put it mildly, is ambiguous. The process of considering and adopting the law at the session apparently will take place with difficulty, in which event it will practically have to be rewritten. Time is overtaking us, and we are overdue. And before us are the elections to local soviets, and an aggressive pre-election campaign is becoming one of the most important political priorities of the Komsomol. The results of the elections on the eve of the Komsomol congress—I would like to emphasize this—essentially will be an assessment of the participation of Komsomol organizations in perestroyka.

Crime is growing in the country. In the 9 months of this year, it increased 33 percent, and young people and adolescents constitute, on the average, one-third of the violators. Critical discussions are going on in the youth environment around the questions of interethnic relations. Outbursts of interethnic hostility are continuing. I have already talked about the fact that the CPSU Central Committee plenum has worked up a platform on questions of national policy. We must certainly also take a position, because until now we have only reacted to crisis situations that have arisen on a wave of an exacerbation of national contradictions, and frequently with delays. True, one principled position of the Bureau of the Komsomol Central Committee was stated, and I hope you have familiarized yourselves with it. It is that we believe it is not permissible in principle to use force in the resolution of interethnic problems.

In the past few months, members of a Central Committee commission have been working in the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] on the instructions of the plenum. I will not go into this question. When we get to it, the comrades will report on the results of their work. The Bureau of the Central Committee devoted quite a lot of effort these 2 and ½ months, together with the first secretaries of the Komsomol organizations of the Russian Federation, to the question of establishing a Russian Federated LKSM [Leninist Communist Youth League]. What can be said here? The Bureau of the Central Committee of the Komsomol is interested in the resolution of the Russian question. I am confident that the LKSM of the union republics, the autonomous republics, the oblasts, and the okrugs will treat this difficult and complex decision with understanding, and that the forthcoming congress of representatives of the Komsomol organizations of the Russian Federation will serve to consolidate all forces of the organization for the renewal of a united league.

Recently we sensed that the dynamism of the development of the youth management structure is not only a positive phenomenon, but that it also has its opposite and very complicated side. The Komsomol virtually showed itself to be unprepared for the sharp increase in the scale of administrative activity. The number of Komsomol enterprises has increased, but the number of workers of the subdivisions of the Komsomol committees working with them directly has been reduced. There are not enough skilled and adequately trained personnel. The majority of inspection commissions of Komsomol organizations are physically incapable of executing functions of control over the activity of an administrative structure that is so developed.

The Bureau of the Komsomol Central Committee believes it necessary in the near future to work up a concept for the development of administrative activities and to submit it for broad consideration. In the final analysis, we must somehow take a position on this question. You will recall that when we were reaching a decision and when we appealed to the government, we absolutely, definitely declared that all of administrative activity would serve the fulfillment of our tasks as stated in the rules. To develop this concept, once more today, after exchanging opinions, we very likely still must define clearly the objective of the administrative activity that the Komsomol is conducting: realization of youth sociopolitical programs at the expense of the material financial resources of the Komsomol, and partially of administrative associations, independently or in cooperation with other organizations.

In international affairs, I would note the full restoration, after a 30-year break, of Komsomol relations with the Communist Youth League of China. In recent weeks, consultation meetings were held with the leadership of the International Union of Students and the World Federation of Democratic Youth on questions concerning the development of international youth cooperation.

In summing up, perhaps, the first part of the report, I would still emphasize the thought that it is absolutely apparent in our work and here, both at the center and locally, that we are lagging seriously in the development of social processes, in the processes of the economy, and in political life.

About the Komsomol.

What is happening in the Komsomol? What should our league be? What lies ahead for us, and what kinds of objectives? We asked ourselves these questions for the third time at Central Committee plenums in the last half year, and we are trying collectively to find an answer to them.

Despite the differences in the assessments of the existing situation that could be heard at the eighth plenum—the precrisis situation, the increase in crisis manifestations, and finally, the crisis—they had one thing in common—anxiety over the present and future of our league. Concern for the state of affairs at all echelons of the Komsomol, and especially in the lower-level organizations. As for the assessments themselves, they can be debated for a long time, and there has already been occasion to debate in Komsomol organizations and to hear different points of view, but it is hardly worth getting into this. You see, whatever we call today's Komsomol condition—crisis or precrisis—it is hardly likely that the situation will change in the league as a whole or in its primary organizations.

In characterizing the present moment, it is simply important for us to look into the situation that has developed in the Komsomol, and most of all through the prism of the state of affairs in the primary organizations. It would probably be worthwhile to say a few words in this connection about the election reports campaign that has come to an end. Analysis of the last stage of the reports and elections, and today they are essentially completed in Komsomol groups, in organizations with primary rights, and in primary elements, local observations indicate: The situation in the Komsomol has not changed for the better in the period that has passed and after the eighth plenum.

The very same processes are continuing: Both the outflow of youth from the Komsomol and the process of lowering the effectiveness of our influence on the youth.

I would like to stipulate immediately, of course, that this is a generalization. One organization is not like another, and you can name quite a few organizations that even in this very complicated situation, nonetheless find themselves. But let us look truth in the eye. In the last 5 years Komsomol numbers have been reduced by one-fourth, or by 10 million persons, including by almost 4 million persons in the last 12 months. The problem here is not even so much in numbers as it is in the attempt to investigate the reasons for this process. The reasons are complicated and diverse. Nonetheless, I will cite one of them, perhaps not the most important one, but in my opinion a very important one: Many Komsomol committees have simply refused to do any kind of agitation work on enrollment in the ranks of the Komsomol, in word and in deed. Just in the last year, 58,000 organizations, including more than 1,000 school organizations, did not enroll even one person in the league. The situation can be assessed in different ways, and different conclusions can be reached, but one thing is unquestionable: Within 5 years, with rates like this, one can reach the conclusion that around us, the liberated workers, there will be concentrations of only small groups of activists.

I would like not to make such a gloomy prognosis, and I am convinced that this will not happen, but, nonetheless, it seems that we have recently lulled ourselves into saying that the process is normal and that the organization is getting rid of deadwood, but it is not possible to consider entire Komsomol organizations deadwood. For, the problem of free exit from the league, which was actively considered earlier, and, judging by everything, which will be considered in the draft Komsomol rules, has grown into a problem of self-dissolution of entire primary organizations. There are a lot of examples of this.

In a number of Komsomol shop organizations in Novosibirsk Oblast and in the city of Norilsk in Krasnoyarskiy Kray, only reports of the bureau of committees of the Komsomol were read at past meetings, but their new staffs were not elected. In some Komsomol organizations, the comrades are refusing to conduct Komsomol meetings under a very interesting pretext: Let the Komsomol first tell us what we are supposed to consider, let them send us some kinds of documents, and then only after this will we decide whether we will conduct meetings or not. This is symptomatic. Workers of the Primorskiy Kray Committee of the Komsomol more than once had to drive to an organization that had dissolved itself. But what I want to say: They reconvened a meeting of Komsomol members, and they spoke frankly and had a heart-to-heart talk, simply speaking sincerely to the people, and they persuaded them, and the organization began its work.

We have no other way. Only personal meetings, only meetings with the Komsomol members, and answers to their questions, if you wish, an honest statement of our problems, and about what we are doing. In convincing people, it is possible to stop the noted process of collapse of individual elements of the Komsomol.

The Komsomol does not claim a monopoly in the youth movement, but it should fight to influence the youth, otherwise what kind of a youth organization is it?

And now in this period that is so difficult for the Komsomol, it is, nonetheless, necessary to examine the causes of the existing situation and, proceeding from them, to work up a clear and understandable plan of action in each element of our league. But the main thing is to act. Not to wait, but to act.

Nonetheless, what is the reason and where are the roots of these processes? I would like to mention a few of them.

First, it is an absolutely apparent isolation of the primary organizations proper and their active members—if you can say it this way in this case—isolation from the real, specific problems of the collective and the young person. It is worth thinking about what causes the most critical discussions in primary organizations. Most frequently of all it is a discussion of the situation in the Komsomol organization itself, but the questions of real life, that which troubles the young people and that which concerns them every day, recedes to the second, third, and fourth level of consideration, giving way to the general discussion. Today, such a withdrawal from life certainly cannot be justified.

Of course, examples can be cited in organizations where a constructive talk was concluded with the adoption of constructive decisions and work, but these examples are more often the exception rather than the rule.

It is not accidental that a majority of the critical remarks, requests, and proposals at meetings are directed at the administration and the managers of enterprises, in whose person Komsomol members see a real opportunity to resolve youth problems. Probably many lose faith in the ability of primary organizations to do anything and to express and defend the interests of their members. There is an aloofness of a majority of the Komsomol organizations from participation in the formation of soviets of labor collectives, the adoption of collective agreements, and preparation for the conduct of elections of deputies to local soviets, etc. These questions can be enumerated ad infinitum.

The content of the work of Komsomol organizations must not be isolated from the problems and queries of any young person. We are obliged to work in such a way so that a Komsomol member can count on the help of his league and so that he himself supports the league, so that the initial point of any beginning is the creation of conditions for revealing the capabilities of the young person in the league and resolving his problems.

Second. In 2 years we became convinced that frequently the aims of the basic organizations stop being the aims of the territorial elements of administration in the Komsomol. As a result of this, the separation between the primary organizations and the superior structures increases, starting with the raykoms [rayon party committees] and ending with the Central Committee of the Komsomol.

Dear comrades in the Central Committee of the Komsomol, I want to tell you quite frankly that we are facing a very serious danger. That bureaucratic centralism against which we spoke so vehemently at the 20th Congress and against which we began to fight clearly has a tendency to grow into a peculiar democracy for the bureaucrats. Sometimes this separation leads to a complete rupture. And recently this tendency has not only not been reduced, but it has even increased.

In Kuybyshev Oblast, certain Komsomol organizations announced their withdrawal from the raykom and gorkom [city party committee] Komsomol structures. At the Komsomol obkom [oblast party committee], an association for professional interests was established. As the process of democratization builds up in the Komsomol, the superior organs will not be able to keep the primary organizations on a short leash of resolutions and financial grants. Only the participation of the lower organizations in our affairs and a mutual penetration of interests can justify our right to a managerial role. I am convinced that there simply is no other way.

Reports and elections have now entered a new stage: rayon and city organization conferences are starting, and kray and oblast Komsomol conferences are approaching. Judging by everything, they will be sharp and very difficult. There is one more alarming observation in this regard. In a majority of the primary organizations, our discussions with you in the plenums of the Komsomol Central Committee and the alternative drafts of the program and of the rules did not arouse any particular interest. We have to think about this.

Before the 21st Komsomol Congress, not detracting from the significance of the elaboration of the drafts of the program documents, and in no way belittling them—we will probably talk again about these documents during our plenum—I will say this: Komsomol members expect the congress to discuss those problems with which we live, and which we encounter every day.

Third. A severe and critical shortage of personnel capable of working under the new conditions is being felt. Time has raised the plank of demands, and it is very difficult for the Komsomol worker to take it. It is not easy to work now. And while we talked last year about alternatives in elections, now, incidentally, at primary echelons, difficulties arise frequently simply with the election of secretaries because of mass refusals to accept office, and indeed, certainly not just at primary echelons. One observes confusion and an inability to foresee the development of events among Komsomol workers, and some are trying to avoid the direct questions of the youth and to sit out this stormy time. Thus, in August and September every third worker of the Mariy Obkom of the Komsomol and of the Osh Obkom of the LKSM of Kirghizia did not attend even one meeting—I mention these not because it is worst of all there, but because our workers were there and know the situation. It must be acknowledged in a self-critical way that the staff of the Komsomol Central Committee does not set an example in this. Twenty-one workers of the Department of Propaganda and Agitation were only at six meetings. On the average, the secretaries of the Komsomol Central Committee attended only one meeting each. A reason can be found for this: For over 2 and ½ months the plenums were simply engulfed in internal league problems, but this is not the way to work.

Everything taken together: The loss of communications with the lower echelons, the passion for paper-shuffling, and the lack of or delayed statements of positions on the most acute problems of the Komsomol and society evoke criticism in the direction of Komsomol workers, and some of them cannot endure it. They move from dialogue with the informals to playing to the gallery; they stop defending positions of principle, and begin to violate rule standards. I would especially like to stress this.

Recently cases like this have been assuming an increasingly widespread and at times even an avalanche-like character. Gross violations of the rules standards were committed in the Dzhezkazgan, Murmansk, Kemerovo, Smolensk, and Tuvin obkoms during an examination of organizational questions regarding the inclusion and exclusion of members of electoral organs, and indeed, I think that this list can be expanded. In the Tymovskiy Raykom of the Komsomol of Sakhalin Oblast, on the initiative of the workers of the staff, temporary LKSM rules were adopted and put into effect on 22 September at an enlarged meeting of the bureau. A reregistration of Komsomol members was started in the rayon. Until the cancellation of the decision by the raykom plenum, 15 of 68 primary organizations succeeded in going through the reregistration. The committee of the Komsomol of the I Medical Facility of the I Moscow Medical Institute decided to conduct a reregistration by handing out Komsomol member registration cards. In discussing questions of restructuring Komsomol work, a meeting of the active members of the Volga auto plant on 11 September decided to take stock of Komsomol members according to Komsomol cards and departmental payment of dues starting on 1 November.

There is probably nothing fatal in these initiatives and beginnings in themselves. Maybe in some ways the comrades are conducting a search for some kinds of resolutions which afterwards could be used by us. But I mentioned all of this in order to say that we have only a few months left before the adoption of the rules. And while these new rules are in the process of elaboration, and until these new rules are adopted, we have no other possibility to be a united organization than to adhere to the requirements of the old rules, even though they do not suit us.

The aspirations of the committees of the Komsomol and their leaders to find real improvement in the activities of their own organizations simply deserves every kind of possible support and approval. But in adopting such decisions, there still must be some kind of consideration and need somehow to coordinate one's positions with the positions of other units of organizations, and a need to cope with the normative principles of activity of our league and with the problems of other organizations.

I have already talked about the fact that the present rules do not suit us, but I am convinced that as long as they are in effect and as long as they exist, their requirements must be fulfilled. The question also comes up about our role—the members of the Komsomol Central Committee—and the local implementation of decisions we adopt. There is also concern about the fact that members of the central electoral organs, who in their time adopted decisions that were obligatory for all, simply allow themselves to violate them in practice.

The last plenum of the Tyumen Obkom was compelled to cancel decisions II, III, and IV of the plenums of their own committee, in the part examining organizational questions, as including violations of the Komsomol rules. Until recently, the Tyumen Obkom of the Komsomol was headed by Nikolay Yashkin, our comrade and a member of the Komsomol Central Committee, who always took an active role in discussions of questions at plenums of the Central Committee, and who also enjoyed prestige among us and the respect of colleagues in elective organs. But I would still like to say that the prestige of the Central Committee will not grow if its members, ardently discussing problems of the Komsomol at plenums of the Komsomol Central Committee, do not also ardently, and also with passion, put into effect jointly adopted decisions in those organizations that they represent.

We discuss drafts of rules and program documents, but they will not work by themselves if we do not promote them in practice.

There is no doubt that the list of reasons for the situation that has taken shape and the proposals issuing therefrom will be continued during the plenum. I think that the members of the Central Committee will support the position of the Bureau that it will be impossible to resolve the problem of restructuring the league without the inclusion of the primary organizations in the orbit of problems of the workers of training collectives, without the orientation of all structures on the needs of primary organizations, without the selection and education of cadres that are capable of heading the process of renewal in Komsomol organizations, and without discipline; however, it will be possible to lose the trust of the youth once and for all.

These, then, are some of the considerations that I wanted to share with you in connection with the current situation and in connection with the talks that are going on in the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Komsomol. I would also ask you, dear comrades, to join in these talks and to express your ideas on the current situation. I thank you.

Further on Mironenko, Komsomol Program

90UN0205A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Oct 89 p 2

[Speech by V. Mironenko, first secretary of the VLKSM]

[Text] The VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee eighth plenum adopted the decision to embark on work on the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Program. A program commission was formed. In fact debate on the four drafts of the VLKSM Program concept began at the plenum, and their propositions were published subsequently in SOBESEDNIK. A further two versions of the program appeared in local youth papers after the plenum. The commission has been unable to formulate an integral program within this timeframe. As far as the drafts which have been submitted are concerned, we concluded, following careful study and discussion in the commission, that, granted all our respect for the authors of all these drafts and their bold and even desperate attempt, it may be said, to snatch such a great weight, preparing the VLKSM Program, it has not as yet been successful. Unfortunately, none of the drafts which were submitted was able to propose in scientific, clearly expounded form a modern vision of the essence of the VLKSM. Each version has its discoveries, interesting ideas and developments, but the overall level of each of them does not, in our view, correspond to the demands which need to be made of such documents.

Of course, the authors of the drafts and the members of the program commission are not to be blamed here. Theoretical vagueness on very many fundamental problems was reflected here also, and, second, it was not possible in the short amount of time allotted for preparation of the draft to grasp reality in full, grasp the movement of thought "below," that which is fed by life and daily practice.

In our opinion, the new character, new quality and new essence of the youth organization should grow primarily from practice, actual social relationships and real life and its requirements and interests, clashes and interactions. You know, when we were working on the draft program, we recalled repeatedly that in revolutionary, pivotal periods each step of practical struggle is many times more important than several programs.

We are not in the least downplaying the significance of this work. We have simply persuaded ourselves on the basis of our own experience of the justice of this thought. At the same time, given the alternative nature of the approaches to the rules, to the development of the VLKSM generally, and given that we lack complete clarity on many questions connected with its organizational arrangement, this has to be debated.

The need in the most important and general outline to precisely formulate and clearly express our position is obvious. The plenum proceeded from this when adopting the decision on preparation of the program. We discussed at length how to operate here. And the idea of a program statement of the VLKSM Central Committee was born in several places precisely from this need and from this discussion. The Central Committee Bureau supported this approach and, on the whole, with observations, the wording of the program statement. We are offering for discussion a version of the statement prepared by the program commission. We provide in the program statement a brief assessment of the situation in the country. Each young person determining his political choice should know to what the VLKSM summons him, what it supports and opposes. We support the country's progress along the path of democratic transformations and the consistent implementation of economic reform and justify the reason why we are for the Communist Youth League, and none other. Why it is necessary to provide for continuity in the radical renovation of the communist youth organization. We have attached particular significance to this.

We do not believe that the entire 70-year path has been an out-and-out mistake and delusion. At the same time we propose our vision of intra-league relations of a fundamentally different nature and define our relations with the CPSU, the pioneer organization and other public organizations, youth included. If the Central Committee plenum agrees with this proposal and the conclusions of the program commission, we propose continuation of the work on the draft Program as follows.

First, changes should be made to the composition of the program commission, it being reduced considerably. I would like to say, incidentally, that the formation of a commission of 50, 60 and more persons is extremely inefficient.

We need to include people who are ready to work on it. Work on the solution of this question or the other. And without giving offense to the comrades who have been on this commission, to exclude people who were not ready to take up this work in practice. Many members of the commission simply lacked the opportunity and were unable to participate in its work.

Second, it is essential to organize discussion at VLKSM meetings, report and election conferences and union republic LKSM [Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee congresses and among youth audiences of the draft program and perform further work thereon with regard for this discussion. Two counterflows should be combined, in our view. On the one hand theoretical, scholarly work on an analysis of the experience and an interpretation of the prospects of the socialist society, on the other, the collective creativity of the youth, from which socialism, and not a caricature thereof, may really grow.

We wish to invite the young people not to "consecrate" a draft VLKSM Program which has already been drawn up, as was the case previously, but to create it themselves, taking the VLKSM Central Committee Program Statement as a basis, simultaneously starting to act right away. I wish to emphasize that the program statement is not a document which is an alternative to the drafts of the VLKSM Program but rather an outline thereof which has imbibed at this stage all that is best which, in our view, is presented in them. Clearly, this is merely a general view, without detailed study, but even this is a particular position and platform. At the same time it would most likely be useful to suggest that all who will take part in the debate on these issues, locally included, familiarize themselves with the existing draft programs also. The very course of discussion of the statement will suggest, I believe, whether we are on the right track or not.

Plenum Decrees, Resolution

90UN0206A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Oct 89 p 1

[Decrees and resolution of the Ninth Central Committee Plenum of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League]

[Text] **Decree of the Ninth Central Committee Plenum of the VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] On the Publication of Material of the Ninth VLKSM Central Committee Plenum**

1. To publish in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA the account of the discussion of the items on the plenum agenda. To entrust to the VLKSM Central Committee press group preparation of the text of the speeches, preserving all proposals and critical remarks without exception.

2. To publish in full the material of the debate on the questions "Information of the VLKSM Central Committee Commission for the Study of Problems Arising in Connection With the Decisions of the 22d Congress of the Lithuanian Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League]" and "Information of the Working Committee Formed To Study the Expediency of the Formation of an LKSM [Leninist Communist Youth League] of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]."

3. To publish all decrees adopted on the questions discussed.

4. In execution of the decision of the Eighth VLKSM Central Committee Plenum, to substantiate once more to the CPSU Central Committee the need for an increase in the size of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA as of 1991.

To instruct the VLKSM Central Committee Bureau to study the possibility of the publication of a supplement in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA (twice monthly) for publication of the "Discussion Platform of the 21st VLKSM Congress."

Resolution of the Ninth VLKSM Central Committee Plenum The Situation That Has Taken Shape in the Areas Which Suffered as a Result of the Accident at the Chernobyl AES [Nuclear Power Station]

Participants in the VLKSM Central Committee plenum share the common concern of komsomol members, the youth, and the entire population living in areas of the RSFSR, the Ukraine, and Belorussia in connection with the situation that has taken shape as a result of the accident at the Chernobyl AES.

Thousands of inhabited localities and hundreds of thousands of people have found themselves in the long-lasting radionuclide fallout zone. They are restricted in the possibilities of using the products of their farms and the gifts of nature. Children's best years are being spent within the framework of every conceivable restriction.

The komsomol committees of the territories which suffered are taking what steps are available to them to assist the primary komsomol organizations and children and young families, but their efforts are insufficient.

While supporting the VLKSM Central Committee Bureau decree on the elaboration of a program to assist the komsomol committees of the areas which suffered as a result of the accident at the Chernobyl AES and the wide-ranging set of measures adopted by the USSR Council of Ministers pertaining to the solution of social questions of the population residing there, the plenum believes that proceeding from the complexity of the situation and the large number of tasks, the support and participation in their accomplishment of the komsomol members and the youth of the entire country are essential.

The plenum appeals to the komsomol committees, pioneer organizations, youth centers, associations, and student detachment headquarters:

to establish republic, kray, and oblast sponsorship relations with the komsomol gorkoms [city committees] and raykoms [rayon committees] located on the territory subjected to radioactive contamination;

to assist in the formation of a fund for assistance to the affected areas;

to seek an opportunity to organize the recreation and treatment of the children and young families from the affected areas in their republics, krays, and oblasts; and to assist in the formation of student detachments for the purpose of building accommodations and social and cultural amenities for the people being resettled.

The plenum appeals to the graduates of agricultural, medical, and teacher-training educational institutions to come to work in the affected areas.

The plenum appeals to the USSR people's deputies from the VLKSM and all people's deputies to monitor ministry and department fulfillment of the official program of assistance to the population of the territories subject to radioactive contamination.

The VLKSM Central Committee plenum appeals to all public organizations to pool their efforts to assist the children, young families, and the whole population which suffered as a result of the accident at the Chernobyl AES.

Decree of the Ninth VLKSM Central Committee Plenum On the Convening of the 21st VLKSM Congress

I. To convene the 21st VLKSM Congress on 11 April 1990 in the city of Moscow.

II. To submit for examination by the congress the following main items of the agenda:

1. Account of the VLKSM Central Committee.

2. Account of the VLKSM Central Auditing Commission.

3. The VLKSM Program.

4. The VLKSM Rules.

5. The VLKSM central authorities.

III. To determine as the representation quota for the 21st VLKSM Congress 1 delegate per 16,000 VLKSM members.

IV. To determine that delegates to the 21st VLKSM Congress be nominated with regard for the opinion of the primary komsomol organizations where they are registered and be elected by closed (secret) ballot.

To determine that the komsomol organizations of the autonomous okrugs, oblasts, and republics elect VLKSM congress delegates directly. Organizations of autonomous okrugs and oblasts whose numbers are fewer than the representation quota will elect one delegate each here.

Upon determination of the number of delegates from oblast, kray, and republic organizations, the numbers of komsomol organizations directly electing delegates to the 21st VLKSM Congress are excluded.

Delegates to the 21st VLKSM Congress cannot be elected by a decision of the secretariat of a bureau or plenum of a komsomol committee. In the komsomol organizations of union republics in which LKSM congresses will not be held prior to the 21st Komsomol Congress, delegates may be elected at LKSM Central Committee enlarged plenums with the participation of representative delegations of the constituent komsomol organizations.

Elsewhere, to grant the right of determination of the procedure for the election of delegates to the 21st VLKSM Congress to the union republic LKSM central committees and komsomol kraykoms and obkoms, the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and the political directorates (departments) of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] internal troops, the USSR KGB border troops, and other military formations.

Procedure for Selecting Officials

90UN0207A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Oct 89 p 1

[Text] **The Central Committee plenum of the VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League, Komsomol] has agreed on a possible procedure for the formation of new Komsomol central authorities and has proposed that Komsomol committees organize work in accordance with this procedure on the nomination of Komsomol members to the Komsomol central authorities.**

The procedure of the formation of the Komsomol central authorities will be determined by the 21st Komsomol Congress. Of the entire diversity of proposed versions of the formation of the Komsomol Central Committee, three fundamental approaches are possible.

One.

The Komsomol congress determines the numerical composition of the Komsomol Central Committee and elects Komsomol Central Committee members at the congress itself. This is what the current Komsomol rules propose.

Two.

The republic, kray, oblast, and okrug Komsomol organizations nominate candidates for the Komsomol Central Committee in accordance with the established quotas. In the event of the congress rejecting any nominations, the corresponding organization retains the exclusive right to submit for the congress' examination a proposal pertaining to a new nomination.

Three.

In accordance with the principle of direct delegation, the republic, kray, oblast, and okrug Komsomol organizations elect Komsomol Central Committee members in accordance with established quotas. Their authority is not established by a special decision of the congress but merely confirmed by the congress' credentials commission.

Such are the most likely approaches to the formation of the Komsomol Central Committee. The congress has the right to adopt any of them. But whereas the first option may be realized by the congress without preliminary preparatory work, the second and third presuppose such work. It is necessary to determine preliminarily the quotas for the republic, kray, oblast, and okrug organizations in the future Komsomol Central Committee.

These organizations would nominate their candidates for the future Komsomol Central Committee in accordance with these quotas. In this case, the 21st Komsomol Congress would be able to realize any of the three possible options. In the first case it would use these nominations as proposals for the election of the Komsomol Central Committee at the congress itself, in the second the congress would be able to establish, following discussion; the authority of the Central Committee members nominated by the Komsomol organizations; in the third the congress, adopting a decision on introduction of the principle of direct delegation, would thereby acknowledge the authority of the Komsomol Central Committee members.

Upon determination of the Komsomol Central Committee representation quotas, it is essential to proceed from the following most important principles:

1. The obligatory representation of the union republic LKSM's [Leninist communist youth leagues] and the Komsomol [VLKSM] organizations of the autonomous republics, oblasts, and okrugs;

2. Representation depending on the numbers of corresponding Komsomol organizations.

For this reason it is essential that in the period up to the 21st Komsomol Congress, the republic, kray, oblast, and okrug Komsomol organizations nominate for the future Komsomol Central Committee candidates based on the representation:

a) from union republic LKSM's, 3 persons each;

—from Komsomol organizations of autonomous republics, oblasts, and okrugs, and also from kray and oblast Komsomol organizations of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the Moscow city Komsomol organization, 1 person each;

—from Komsomol organizations of the Soviet Army and the USSR Navy, 3 persons, and from the border and internal troops, 1 person each.

b) proceeding from the numbers of union republic LKSM's, kray and oblast Komsomol organizations of the RSFSR, and Komsomol organizations of the USSR Armed Forces, in accordance with the representation quota of 1 person per 200,000 Komsomol members. The numbers of Komsomol organizations of the autonomous formations which are a part of republic, kray, and oblast organizations are excluded here upon determination of the number of nominees for the Komsomol Central Committee from the numbers of the corresponding republic, kray, and oblast organizations.

This procedure will make it possible to nominate 272 persons for the Komsomol Central Committee. Submission for examination by the congress of the question of the abolition of the institution of Central Committee candidates is also proposed.

To grant the union republic LKSM central committees, the Komsomol kraykoms [kray committees], obkoms [oblast committees], and okruzhkoms [okrug committees], the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and the political directorates (departments) of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] internal troops and the USSR KGB border troops the right to determine the procedure for nomination of candidates for the Komsomol Central Committee. Their nomination may be passed at union republic LKSM congresses where such are planned, at republic and interrayon conferences, at conferences of kray, oblast, and okrug Komsomol organizations, at conferences of Komsomol organizations of the USSR Armed Forces, and also at enlarged plenums of the union republic LKSM central committees. The nomination of candidates by decision of the secretariat, bureau, and plenum (except for an enlarged plenum) of a Komsomol committee is not permitted.

It is proposed that the Komsomol's central control body be elected at the Komsomol congress; that the republic, kray, and oblast Komsomol organizations nominate candidates for it; and that the proposal concerning the election of a control body of 70 persons be submitted for examination by the congress.

Auditing Commission's Personnel Changes

90UN0197A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 Oct 89 p 1

[Text] The Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Auditing Commission's Ninth Session has been held in Moscow.

The session discussed suggestions for the draft Komsomol rules on intra-union supervision, principles of the formation of the Komsomol budget and the basic indicators of the Komsomol Central Committee budget for 1990, which will be submitted for examination by the Komsomol Central Committee Ninth Plenum.

Organizational matters were examined.

In accordance with the proposals of the appropriate Komsomol obkoms and union republic Komsomol central committees, the Komsomol Central Auditing Commission expelled U. Abdurakhmonov, former first secretary of the Uzbek Komsomol Dzhizak Obkom, A. Voyba, worker of the Merkulskiy Tea-Growing Sovkhoz [state farm] of the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Abkhaz ASSR's [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] Ochamchirskiy Rayon, I. Ishchenko, former first secretary of the Komsomol Kabardino-Balkar Obkom, V. Kravlaydis, former first secretary of the Komsomol Vologda Obkom, V. [illegible], former first secretary of the Komsomol Kaliningrad Obkom, G. Muradimova, optician- engineer of the Bashkir ASSR Salavat Optical Engineering Plant, S. Shevchenko, former first secretary of the Ukrainian Komsomol Voroshilovgrad Obkom, and M. Shklyayeva, housewife of the city of Severodvinsk of Arkhangel Oblast.

The Komsomol Central Auditing Commission coopted G. Anichkin, chairman of the Auditing Commission of the Moscow city Komsomol organization, M. Yegetaliyev, chief economist of the Kolkhoz [collective farm] imeni 20th Party Congress of the Uzbek SSR Fergana Oblast's Buvaydinskiy Rayon, A. Krasilnikov, first secretary of the Komsomol Vologda Obkom, A. Milov, deputy director of the Production Association imeni A.M. Tarasov of the city of Kuybyshev, V. Palchuk, first secretary of the Ukrainian Komsomol Crimea Obkom, and V. Tolstykh, first secretary of the Komsomol Kaliningrad Obkom.

The commission elected G. Anichkin, chairman of the Auditing Commission of the Moscow city Komsomol organization, a member of the Komsomol Central Auditing Commission Bureau.

The commission elected as members of the Bureau and confirmed as leaders of subcommissions of the Komsomol Central Auditing Commission S. Levitskaya and A. Milov.

The commission confirmed V. Shunyayev, member of the Bureau and executive secretary of the Komsomol Central Auditing Commission, leader of a subcommission.

Lithuania's Macaitis on Komsomol Decision

LD3010231589 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Telephone interview with Alfonsas Macaitis, first secretary of the Lithuanian Komsomol Central Committee, by Jurate Valanciute; date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Macaitis] The question concerning the Lithuanian Komsomol organization was discussed [at the Moscow All-Union Komsomol Central Committee plenum], that is, the decision that was not adopted at the previous plenum was adopted at this one.

The decision says that the Lithuanian Komsomol does not exist as such and that this organization is not within the composition of the All-Union Komsomol organization.

The second clause of the decision says that cooperation with the Lithuanian Komsomol should continue and that a cooperation treaty should be signed, the one we have already discussed.

However, what really causes the concern is the decision of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee that other clauses should also be included in the decision which state that an organization parallel to the Lithuanian Komsomol should also be set up. This is, in fact, the legalization of the old All-Union Komsomol, and to be more precise, this sets up the All-Union Komsomol in Lithuania by their own decision.

It seems that attempts will be made to set up these organizations beginning with primary ones and ending up with the Central Committee. [passage omitted]

What I fear most is that this could cause a split on nationality basis. This is what I have doubts about and I think that the plenum has made a gross mistake making such a decision. [passage omitted]

Congress of RSFSR Komsomol Organizations Set

PM0211144789 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Nov 89 p 1

["All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League Central Committee Ninth Plenum Resolution on Convening Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Youth League Organizations"]

[Text] 1. To support the proposal of the conference of members of central elected organs of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol] and representatives of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Komsomol organizations on convening a congress of RSFSR Komsomol organizations in Moscow 15 February 1990.

To submit for congress examination questions connected with the formation of an RSFSR Leninist Communist Youth League, the necessity of adopting a republic youth league Program and Statutes, and the drafting of proposals on the RSFSR Komsomol's leading organ and the procedure for its formation, and to discuss proposals addressed to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

2. The election of delegates to the congress of RSFSR Komsomol organizations is to be carried out analogously to the norm and procedure for electing delegates to the 21st All-Union Komsomol Congress. Conferences of Komsomol kray, oblast, and okrug organizations are to be granted the right to invest delegates to the 21st All-Union Komsomol Congress with the powers of delegates to the congress of RSFSR Komsomol organizations.

3. To form an Organizing Committee To Prepare and Conduct the Congress of RSFSR Komsomol Organizations and empower it to set up working parties. To instruct the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Bureau to confirm the Organizing Committee's composition by 4 November, providing for the possibility of representatives of all RSFSR Komsomol oblast and kray organizations to be included in it.

4. The editorial offices of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, the magazines MOLODOY KOMMUNIST and KOMSOMOLSKAYA ZHIZN, and other youth mass media are to give extensive coverage to preparation for the congress of RSFSR Komsomol organizations.

5. The All-Union Komsomol Central Committee Secretariat and Bureau are to provide the necessary assistance to the Organizing Committee in solving all questions concerned with the formation of the RSFSR Komsomol.

Posters Urge Protest at Lyubyanka Prison

LD2910165189 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1412 GMT 29 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, October 29 (TANJUG)—To be seen on many houses in the city of Moscow this morning was a call for the inhabitants to come in front of the ill-famed prison of Lyubyanka, in the centre of Moscow, tomorrow and, holding hands, make "a human chain." The call was signed by the Memorial, a social organisation which gathers and publishes documents about the Stalin terror's victims.

The Moscow inhabitants are being called to, while bearing candles lit in their hands, pay their respects to the victims of all secret polices from the Great October Revolution in Russia in 1917 to date.

"Together we are invincible," the poster says. Torn down have been such posters on many houses.

MVD Responds to Criticism of Remand Conditions

PM0211143789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed article under the rubric "After Criticism": "The Law Demands Order"]

[Text] The report "For Whom Does the Prison Weep?" published 30 August under the heading "An Ordinary Day at 38, Petrovka Street" raised problems of the work of Moscow's remand centers [sledstvennyy izolyator]. I. Katargin, member of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] Collegium, informed the Editorial Office that the article objectively and constructively reflected the serious deterioration in the situation at Moscow City's No 2 Remand Center. The main reasons for this situation were revealed. The problems raised are typical of most of the country's remand centers.

Measures are being taken to strengthen the material base of these institutions, to upgrade the conditions under which persons are kept in custody, to improve educational and preventive work, and to strengthen the cadre staff. In order to educate personnel in a spirit of observing the law when dealing with prisoners and to raise the standard of vocational training, more than 2,000 remand center workers have trained this year at MVD and Internal Affairs Administration training centers and retrained at the ministry's educational establishments.

However, the inadequate funding, the features of the job, the lack of prestige associated with working in these institutions, and current pay rates make it harder to attract quality staff. The newspaper was right to note the staff's inadequate legal protection against attacks by criminals. The state of affairs at remand centers has been examined at a session of the USSR MVD Collegium. Measures envisaging a fundamental restructuring of the work have been defined. As of 1990 the material position of the guards [kontrolerskiy sostav] will be improved and capital investment in the construction of housing for staffers will be increased. In the near future it is planned to overhaul a number of centers, including Moscow City's No 2 Remand Center.

Proposals have been submitted to legislative organs on increasing legal protection for workers at penal institutions and raising the criminal responsibility of prisoners and convicts for criminal attacks on staff. Other measures are being taken too.

Journalists Briefed on MVD Troop Deployment

90UN0187A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Oct 89 First Edition p 4

[Article by Colonel R. Makushin: "The Goal: Stability and Legal Order"]

[Text] A briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists took place on October 24. At the briefing Colonel General Yu. Shatalin, who is in charge of internal security forces of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], announced the following figures. At present there are 1,800 military personnel in Armenia (most of them are permanently stationed there), 2,600 in Baku (about 1,000 of those were reassigned from other regions), a total of 3,600 in Azerbaijan, 4,500 in Georgia, including Abkhaziya, and 2,300 in Uzbekistan, including Fergana. All in all over the entire country, 16,700 MVD troops are in places other than their permanent stations.

As of July 25, 1989, according to the orders of the minister of internal affairs, internal security forces are guarding a number of locations along the Azerbaijan Railroad, including certain tunnels and bridges. Army units provide security for engine and railroad maintenance teams; they escort trains, patrol railroad stations and the most vulnerable sections of the railroad. As a result of these measures, the traffic of passenger and freight trains has been restored on the Azerbaijan Railroad in the direction of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

In Nagorno-Karabakh, internal security troops are escorting truck convoys. By the beginning of October they escorted through over 600 convoys or altogether about 7,000 vehicles. More than 3,000 of those carried consumer goods, almost 2,000 automobiles transported people and over 1,200 trucks carried food. These convoys were attacked [illegible] times and more than 30 people were injured. Lately, the cases of armed attacks against the servicemen of internal troops in Nagorno-Karabakh have become more frequent.

During the period from February 1988, internal security forces together with the organs of internal affairs confiscated several thousand firearms and about 2 tons of explosives. Over 60,000 people were detained for committing various crimes and violating the curfew. The troops used arms 41 times and only in extreme situations.

[Signed] Colonel R. Makushin

Baklanov Talks With MiG Aircraft Plant Workers

PM0311114789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Increase Labor Contribution"]

[Text] The eve of the October Revolution is a responsible stage in the life of Muscovites and all the country's workers. Perestroyka increases many times over each labor collective's responsibility for the end results of work and requires an even more specific and purposeful quest for ways and opportunities to make progress in every area. Such is also the mood now among workers at Moscow's A.I. Mikoyan Machine Building Plant, which was visited 2 November by CPSU Central Committee Secretary O.D. Baklanov.

The country is indebted to that enterprise for the creation of the famous MiG aircraft. One of them, the MiG-29, is well known to specialists, and not only those in the Soviet Union. This machine recently gave convincing demonstrations of its aerial capabilities at world air shows in Britain and France.

In the life of the enterprise and its highly skilled collective this year has been in many respects a difficult and even crucial period. A long-term strategy has to be chosen. The processes of conversion, which have also had a significant impact on the plant are not viewed here merely as the mechanical shortening of the production runs of machines under development. The main task in these conditions, the CPSU Central Committee secretary stressed, is to achieve a higher standard of designs and ensure a rapid model replacement rate for industry.

The formula "Quality, not quantity" enables the aircraft builders to use some capacities for the solution of important tasks. These include the production of equipment for agricultural production and the processing of output as well as machinery and mechanisms for light industry. Aircraft builders are paying increasing attention to supplying the domestic market with goods which people particularly need.

The collective has plenty of good ideas in this respect. But why are many of them not implemented? Why do most of the goods developed here for the market still not have specific manufacturers to produce them? These questions require an immediate answer, the CPSU Central Committee secretary said. You can only create so many exhibition models. As Soviet people implement perestroyka they want to see tangible results of their work and improvements right now. We have no more time for shilly-shallying.

Shilly-shallying is all the more intolerable when it comes to the solution of questions of the collective' social development.

Around 500 of the plant's workers are now on the waiting list for improved housing conditions. But the construction of housing by the own-resources method is developing at a clearly unsatisfactory rate at the enterprise, as the CPSU Central Committee secretary pointed out. He noted that housing construction by that method is a task of paramount importance.

This is one of the many measures that must be resolved in order to retain the cadres of the unique production facility as solicitously as possible. There is already a shortage, especially of machine tool operators, the aircraft makers say.

In these conditions, surely, one should pay special attention to people's needs and fight for every production worker. But workers and engineers at the plant which produces the world's best aircraft have to wait in line for their meals.

Questions in need of urgent examination were touched on. There was a discussion, for example, on improving pensions for test pilots. People whose lives are bound up with the improvement of new aircraft equipment must have secure social protection, the CPSU Central Committee secretary noted.

His comradely conversations with aircraft makers began in the workplace and continued at a meeting of the enterprise's party and economic aktiv.

A number of the questions related to the plant's future in conditions of the transition to modern forms of economic management and conversion, people asked about the innovations in party building and the deepening of socialist democracy, and many are concerned at the fact that the perestroyka processes in society are running into obstacles and hindrances. The main concern voiced in the speeches and rejoinders was how to eliminate the bottlenecks more quickly. This can only be achieved, participants in the meeting said, by constantly increasing the labor contribution of every collective.

O.D. Baklanov was accompanied by O.S. Belyakov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Defense Department, and other party and economic leaders.

Readers' Letters Show 'Spiritual Unease'

PM0911129189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Nov 89 Morning Edition p2

[Roundup of readers' letters by Lyudmila Savelyeva, special correspondent in the letters department, under the rubric "Reading the Mail": "Return to the Individual"]

[Text] "Where are we headed?" This question is perhaps the one that comes up the most often in the latest IZVESTIYA mailbag. It has been asked before, but not with the same urgency and not with the same degree of accompanying emotion. There is real panic here: "Are we moving toward collapse, toward complete chaos?" (M. Belyy, Pinsk). There is bitterness: "Is there any such thing as soviet power in our country?" (N. Kovalenkov, Poltava). And there is bewilderment: "Are we regressing, toward capitalism?" (G. Kriva, Kiev). "We used to have a peaceful life," V. Ivanov from Volgograd writes. "But now? Strikes, national unrest, endless rallies—where has all this come from, and why?"

This nostalgia for the old, quiet life is to be found in many letters. "We are tired of politics," V. Romanenko from Kerch writes. "Wrought up by the waiting lines, the prices, and the confusion everywhere, we want to see real changes." "There is probably no other country in the world that is living and breathing politics as we are now," G. Kucherov from Sevastopol says. "We are forever talking, discussing, and branding either the cooperatives or the faceless bureaucrats. If we are going to be honest, restructuring has simply created new problems and consequently a new struggle against them." G. Shulgina from Rostov-on-Don is even more categorical: "Many people are not ready for democracy and have misinterpreted it, so all rallies and strikes should be banned and everyone forced to work, rather than tear down the edifice of socialism in the 72d year of Soviet power."

All in all, there is plenty of alarm and spiritual unease. Some are in a hurry to blame "restructuring and democracy" for everything, others blame our "meek and mild government" (L. Stepnov, Orel), others condemn "socialism in general" (K. Kryuchkov, Ivanovo), and others rush to the defense of "the sacred ideals of socialism, which are being trodden underfoot..." (P. Beletskiy, Pskov).

The quotations above perhaps convey the most extreme moods of our readers. Emotions aside, they primarily reveal the confusion felt by some members of our society as a result of the changes taking place in our life. These changes are complex, contradictory, and rapid—and we are obviously finding it hard to keep up with them. "All these new ideas have come crashing down on us like an avalanche," K. Bobylev from Penza remarks, "and we have found ourselves unable to either understand or accept them."

Continuing this same idea, M. Prokopyev from Dushanbe remarks: "I am sure that one of the reasons why our economy is simply marking time and why there is consequently such turmoil in people's minds is that few want to risk their small but reliable wage, which provides the bare essentials of life, for the sake of new production relations and the unknown. Our argument is simple: It may be bad, it may not be much, but at least it is our own and it is familiar." "We involuntarily reject the new, not because we love the old but because the new always seems alien and frightening," M. Kustov from Sverdlovsk echoes M. Prokopyev. "And we cannot discount the genies of the decades: They will make their presence felt for a long time to come."

Many readers share this viewpoint. "When laying bare all our problems and ills, we must be aware that disheartened people will have their sentiments provoked as a result," M. Uvaydov from Tashkent stresses. "These are inevitable growing pains: We will outgrow them and develop the necessary immunity." As far as nostalgia for the past is concerned, it is probably best not to talk about it to A. Gladkiy from Rostov Oblast, who says: "I am an old man now. My generation has lived through everything: Starvation, Stalin's carnage, the war, and, most important of all, the impossibility of being a free man. When I see some zealot charging into battle to defend the 'happy past' and 'ideals and principles,' I well understand what they want to do: They want to reduce everyone to the same level. It is simple: Dress them in bast shoes and ragged peasant's coats, get everyone to stand to attention, and order them to 'be silent'—and there you will have the 'real Soviet man.' We have begun a noble and difficult task and should not give up now."

Many are troubled by the same thought. "We ourselves are the main obstacles in the way of renewal"—so L. Kozorez from Rubezhnoye is convinced. "Rushing to extremes, as if to spite ourselves we are simply destabilizing and fueling the situation. Already, many have frozen in horror just at the one expression 'private ownership.' What is this, they say: Are we going forward to capitalism? The dogma that we have assimilated with all the diligence of an excellent scholar is the main obstacle standing in the way of our progress: progress toward socialism, of course, but real, not imaginary socialism."

"We need unabridged socialism, without illusions, without hypnosis, without the prejudice of once-accepted directives," V. Gorbay from Odessa pursues this idea. "But, whereas our thinking is aggressive, our everyday life leaves much to be desired—and that is why we are panicking."

Many readers draw attention to the need for a sober, honest view of our far from simple reality precisely now, in the period of political reform, "the essence of which aims to give real, full power to the soviets, as was also proclaimed in October 1917" (Yu. Kondratyev, Ordzhonikidze), when we are taking "the first and, perhaps because of this, not always sure, confident steps toward a truly socialist, rule-of-law, democratic state" (Yu. Yulanov, Sverdlovsk).

I. Melnikova (Ufa) asks: "Precisely which social consequences—in connection with the forthcoming adoption of progressive laws on ownership and land—are people afraid of? The stratification of society into rich and poor? We do not have that sort of thing now, of course? We should say without kidding ourselves: We have had enough of wishful thinking." "The social revolution is essentially the replacement of outmoded production incentives with more progressive incentives," Ye. Belyayev from Leningrad believes. "It is impossible to educate people by goading them on at every step while taking away the results of their work under the guise of acting in national state interests, which have long ago ceased to be such, for one simple reason: their core—the individual—has been removed."

"The workers are the ones in charge?" S. Galkin from Torez asks. "Who are you trying to kid? They are hired labor with no real power over the administration. Walking up to the double doors of these administrative gods, you check more than once that you have taken your hat off."

S. Balanovskiy from Moscow notes: "A lot of people in our country want to live like Americans but work like Soviets. The latter has a synonym—everyone must be given the same. You can work any old way or you can work flat out—the wages will be the same anyway. Everyone in our country has a job but no one sets any store by the fact. On the other hand, everyone demands that all have a strictly equal share of material wealth; naturally, this material wealth is not very great and, naturally, it is not very great for the simple reason that no one wants to create it."

There are so many letters in the mail that contain warnings and appeals: We must not retreat in "fear of the newness of the path on which we have embarked: to cleanse our society of pseudo-values, pseudo-indicators, and a pseudo-happy life," M. Sivoglazov from Chardzhou writes.

Many stress that we must bear in mind the social weariness which is also making itself felt: "Over the decades of silence and excessive regimentation of our existence, too many 'negative charges,' if you like, have built up. Now everyone is discharging this tension in whatever way they can: strikes, rallies.... The burden of unresolved problems is too great to solve everything at once, en masse—we could find ourselves stuck in the 'bog of stagnation'" (A. Kalashnikov, Moscow).

"Where are we going?" This question is probably now on everyone's lips. Every one of us is seeking his own answer, of course, but, at the same time, we are all trying to reach a general conclusion together. It cannot be denied that this is far from easy. The opinion of the majority of readers is possibly most clearly expressed by L. Golyas, deputy chief of the Volga Motor Vehicle Plant Production Administration, in Tolyatti: "Life is difficult and worrying at present, but it is also extremely interesting. Society is awakening from its sleep of lethargy. Its self-awareness is taking shape, while common human values and man's needs as an individual are beginning to play a really decisive role. But our thinking is still resisting this at present. The ideological dogma driven home by fire and sword has led to firmly established psychological stereotyping. To use Marx' graphic expression, the dead are catching at the living."

But, on the other hand, the author of the letter stresses (and this viewpoint is shared by many readers), the difficulties in our life, which "we cannot fail to stumble over since they are like sharp corners at literally every step," cannot be explained away by our conservative thinking alone. Whatever their cause (readers include the many years during which the economy has operated "contrary to elementary economic laws" and the slow pace of economic reform among the main reasons), they nevertheless believe that it is essential to overcome the most urgent problems at all costs and as soon as possible. "A primitive piece of soap hits restructuring with all the force of a long-range weapon—that is what hurts and what should not be forgotten," L. Pavlenko from Vinnitsa remarks bitterly. Many urgently stress that the new policy urgently needs to be backed up in material respects: with real improvement in our everyday lives.

The distressed cry "we are tired of politics" comes to mind. But, if that is the case, does it mean that we should go back to the "quiet life"? But even those calling for this are hardly likely to succeed. They will not succeed if only because all of us have become different people, without even noticing it. Where are we going? We are returning to ourselves by grasping our true values.

Draft Law Seeks to Improve Leave Conditions

*PM0111142989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Law on Leave Being Prepared"]

[Text] On examining the draft USSR Law on Leave at a regular session 28 October, the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium pointed out that the existing procedure and conditions for granting leave have to a considerable extent become obsolete and do not correspond to modern requirements.

The granting of leave is governed by numerous normative acts which are poorly interconnected. The length of leave hardly depends on the quantity and quality of the labor expended or the working conditions. The existing leave provisions are inadequately geared to implementing an active social policy and do not create the necessary conditions for restoring fitness for work, preserving working people's health, developing the individual's creative potential, strengthening the family, or protecting mothers and children.

The USSR Council of Ministers Presidium has approved the first draft law on leave to be drawn up in the country, noting the great socioeconomic significance of the legislative regulation of working people's constitutional right to rest.

The draft plans to improve the systematic approach to granting leave and to increase the minimum duration of leave. Priority attention is devoted to improving the leave system for working people employed in work underground or in work involving harmful, difficult, or other unfavorable working conditions. Measures have been determined to increase social leave, above all for war and labor veterans, invalids, and women with children. It is proposed to extend the rights of union republics and labor collectives in establishing leave.

After modification, taking into account the comments of ministries, departments, and trade union organs, the draft law will very soon be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Deputy's Comments on Kuriles Spark Reaction

*PM0811105389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
4 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4*

[Nonstaff Correspondent V. Ryabchikov report: "Condemning Irresponsibility"]

[Text] Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk City—In Yuzhno-Kurilskiy Rayon, as in other rayons of Sakhalin Oblast, the preparations for the elections of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and local soviet people's deputies are developing constantly. The rayon party organization's draft election platform is being discussed with great interest. The people of Yuzhno-Kurilsk are expressing the most fervent approval for that part of the platform which says that the rayon's Communists and party organizations deem it their duty to support in every way the patriotic movement defending the Soviet Union's undisputed ownership of the Kurile Islands and resolutely oppose all proposals to transfer this age-old Russian land to the ownership of another state.

The discussion of the draft coincided with the publication in PRAVDA of a report entitled "Irresponsibility." What is the connection between them? A most direct one.

The report, as is well known, discusses the unprecedented statement by USSR People's Deputy Yu. Afanasyev, rector of the Moscow Historical Archives Institute, at a symposium in Japan. In the statement the author calls unambiguously for "the return of the four Kurile Islands to Japan."

Of course, such frank impudence and irresponsibility was not only flatly rejected by the islanders but also caused quite understandable indignation. Rallies and meetings are being held in the rayon where participants have adopted protest resolutions and sent an urgent demand to the USSR Supreme Soviet that the statement by USSR People's Deputy Yu. Afanasyev be duly assessed.

A similar resolution was unanimously adopted by the Sakhalin CPSU Oblast Committee [obkom] plenum. The resolution says: "The liberation of South Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands from the Japanese militarists was an act of historical justice because they were originally discovered and developed by Russia and Russian people. Soviet servicemen shed their blood in the islands' liberation in 1945. Now the thousands-strong population of the Kurile Islands, the majority of whom were born and raised there, consider them their motherland and native home."

Later the CPSU obkom plenum resolution says: "USSR People's Deputy Yu.N. Afanasyev's statement is to be condemned as irresponsible, one which supports the Japanese revanchists' unlawful territorial claims and disregards Soviet people's opinion.

"It is requested that the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Moscow CPSU City Committee, and the party committee of the Moscow Historical Archives Institute make a principled assessment of the comment by Comrade Yu.N. Afanasyev, a USSR people's deputy and CPSU member, and inform the oblast's residents and the Sakhalin CPSU Obkom of the results.

"The PRAVDA editorial collective is asked to publish the Sakhalin CPSU Obkom plenum's decision."

Novosibirsk Obkom Elects First Secretary

LD3010193389

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1530 GMT on 30 October in the "Vremya" newscast broadcasts a 2-minute video report by V. Tyabotin on the 30 October Novosibirsk Oblast Committee (obkom) Plenum.

Tybotin interviews participants and the video shows scenes of the plenum. Tybotin then says that Novosibirsk Obkom First Secretary Vladimir Vasiliyevich Kazerezov decided to request retirement on the grounds of illness and notes that the request was met with great regret. During the 2 weeks preceeding the plenum discussions were held and it was decided to hold elections on an alternative basis. There were calls for even greater democratization in internal party life and in the procedures of elections.

The announcer says that "as a result of elections which took place on an alternative basis, Vitaliy Petrovich Mukha was elected first secretary of the Novosibirsk Obkom."

Economic

Officials Debate Reforms at Economic Conference

PM0711143789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Nov 89 First Edition pp 1, 2

[V. Badov, A. Kolesnichenko, A. Nikitin, and A. Fedotov report: "Economic Reform at a Crossroads"]

[Text] **The truth is no respecter of ranks or titles. Regardless of the "degrees" held by the academics and practitioners who gathered in the Party Central Committee to debate the problems of economic development, they all were equal before the truth. Especially since the debate itself was held without the "advance material" customary for such occasions, from scratch as it were. This testifies to the new democratic atmosphere within the party. We are parting company with the obsolete apparatus style, when the quest for "truth" proceeded on the basis of answers prepared in advance.**

Let us note something that we regard as a substantial factor: The debate was held at the party Central Committee and this, we believe, is a sign of the weight and importance of the questions raised here. After all, the issues concerned the future of economic reform, which ultimately determines the country's future.

Recently, the speakers noted, there have been increasingly frequent debates outside the party and at times against the party. Moreover, these debates have been far removed from the problems perturbing our people, and mainly from the quest for the constructive results society needs.

The debate in the Party Central Committee was actually distinguished by considered thinking and specific proposals aimed at economic recovery and improvement of the people's life.

The report on this debate was prepared by V. Badov, A. Kolesnichenko, A. Nikitin, and A. Fedotov.

Perestroyka through scientists' eyes. How to restore the ruble's health? Regional economic accountability. Ownership: What form should it take? What is hindering our advance?

All these topics were discussed at the second meeting of eminent economists, leaders of central and republican departments and labor collectives, and USSR people's deputies in the CPSU Central Committee.

M.S. Gorbachev opened the debate and delivered a closing speech at the meeting.

Solid Instead of "Volatile" Money

No matter what problem you look at—be it housing, health care, education, or the lack of social protection for low-income strata of the population—they all boil down to the problem of market equilibrium, according to N.M. Rimashevskaya, director of the Institute for Socioeconomic Problems and Demography under the USSR Academy of Sciences and the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems.

"Volatile" money with nothing to spend it on has provided the basis for a substantial redistribution of income by unlawful methods—bribery, speculation, and racketeering. According to USSR State Committee for Statistics data, the ratio between the incomes enjoyed by the bottom 10 percent and the top 10 percent of the population is approximately 1:3.5. A very low figure! According to some indirect data, this difference is far greater in reality—the gap is almost tenfold. Consequently, it is actually this "volatile" money that is largely the cause of the stratification of society.

Market disequilibrium did not develop today or even yesterday. At present, however, it is like a mountain stream, sweeping away everything in its path. We are no longer talking about decelerating this process but about preventing its further acceleration. Moreover, it is impossible to remedy the market situation at the population's expense. We need nontraditional measures: The development of family farming, support for cooperatives. There is also the task of "soaking up" the population's surplus money through the sale of housing and land. A study conducted by the institute, N.M. Rimashevskaya noted, shows that approximately half of family savings are earmarked for the improvement of housing conditions. Therefore, the population is ready for such measures.

How did we try to repair the commodity-money disequilibrium? V.I. Shcherbakov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, noted in his speech. We divided money into cash and noncash, and brought each of these two categories into equilibrium. But equilibrium didn't happen! We then proceeded to make another division—this time of noncash money—into construction and installation funds, equipment funds, and so on. Briefly speaking, we expanded enterprises' rights not in the earning but in the spending of money. We made it possible to artificially hike prices and pay out all kinds of money. We are living with the results today....

I think that now we have at least R200 billion of "volatile" money chasing goods in the consumer market, Academician O.T. Bogomolov, USSR people's deputy and director of the Economics of the World Socialist System Institute, said. Nobody knows the exact amount of rubles sitting in enterprises' accounts with nothing to be spent on. There is no accurate information on the amount of the USSR State Bank's credit resources. This is bad, because it is impossible to regulate the money and commodity markets without accurate "navigational instruments." The only thing that is clear is that there is a large surplus of money and that confidence in it is declining. The consumer market is being ruined. Exchanges in industry are beginning to take the form of barter. I think that the situation is complex but not hopeless. It can be remedied.

A start must be made by getting the money supply right. Without this it is impossible to create a genuine market, the need for which is recognized by everyone today. The ruble must regain its solidity. How is this to be achieved? It is a very complex matter, because there are major social constraints. It is impossible to disturb prices too much, it is impossible to freeze wages. It is impossible to apply compulsory loans or to exchange 10 old rubles for 1 new ruble—all this would be unfair. In the academician's opinion, the package of anti-inflation measures underlying the budget and plan are correct but inadequate. Realistically speaking, they will not remedy the situation. This is why it is necessary to seek additional opportunities.

It would probably make sense to take the path of selling assets held by the state. This would involve selling shares to working people, especially in small and medium enterprises. This would help to divert a certain amount of "volatile" money from the consumer market. I think that this is important in every respect. Today we wish to guarantee human rights politically. But this is not enough. Citizens must also have a certain economic autonomy and independence—their own home or apartment, their own plot of land, a partnership or shareholding. Most importantly, the complete freedom to dispose of their own labor. This labor also must have its own value. If it cannot be fully applied at home, then evidently—following the example of other socialist countries—people should be permitted to earn money abroad. This would produce a major influx of foreign currency for the country and make it possible to adopt the world experience of industrial organization and boost the skills of workers and specialists.

I think, O.T. Bogomolov went on, that we cannot avoid creating a market. When you have money circulating in billions and yet worth nothing, you do not and cannot have a market. There will be a steady reversion to barter. It is necessary to create a currency which would be convertible from the very start, in parallel with the present ruble. Maybe a gold ruble or chervonets, as in the twenties?

In the opinion of G.S. Khizha, general director of Leningrad's "Svetlana" Association, the main source of inflation is the state budget deficit, which ultimately ends up as a superfluous mass of money. There have been many reasons for this. But how do we achieve victory? The first method is to calculate profit. Profit in our country is not the difference between income and expenditure, it is something else which enables a sizable proportion of any production costs to be factored into the finished product. In other words, uninstalled equipment, materials stocks, and work in progress must not be included in [PRAVDA 6 November Second Edition adds here "the prime cost of"] production. This would mean that any rise in stocks or losses would not result in a rise in fictitious, paper profits. G.S. Khizha proposed the introduction of profit calculations based not on commodity output, but on economic activity without waiting for a new law. In his opinion, this would produce very fast and efficient results.

Why is this important? People, the director said, are very sensitive about the unfairness created by "easy" money. I hold reception sessions for workers every Tuesday. Mainly attended by those who have neither money nor housing. Should we sell all the apartments to those who have money to spare? In my view, this is not our way, it will only aggravate the situation.

In the director's opinion, it is necessary to change in one fell swoop the scale of prices and earnings, with all unearned accumulations being sharply devalued while earned incomes acquire greater weight. This should be a countrywide measure. As regards the "Svetlana" Association, working people and pensioners there are prepared to invest their accumulations right away in inscribed stock in enterprises. This would be one way to quickly compensate people for this money on an equal scale. All the rest would be virtually devalued and would play no role at all. At the same time, it is necessary to introduce progressive taxation on inheritance and other incomes, including income from property sales. Briefly speaking, all financial operations must be taxable.

As for the idea of auction sales of foreign currency at realistic prices, this would probably be appropriate. This would be one way to replace some of the devalued money by foreign currency and get rid of surplus money.

It seems to me that some of our deliberations about accumulated money are excessively abstract, USSR People's Deputy G.Kh. Popov, chief editor of the journal VOPROSY EKONOMIKI, noted in his speech. One-third of the population have no accumulations at all, living from payday to payday, and are totally at a loss to comprehend what we are actually saying.

Yes, accumulated money does indeed exist, but it is a profound misconception to imagine that those who hold it would be interested in imported mass consumer goods. They already have these goods. This problem requires a different approach.

The second question on which G.Kh. Popov dwelt was the problem of social justice. One aspect of this is payments by the state from money which it should have paid out to working people at the very beginning. The discussion on the budget produced endless requests to the center—let's have money for children, let's have money for the countryside, let's have money for health care. When you think about it, the countryside, children, the disabled, and so on really do need money. It is necessary to pause and ponder the extent to which it is sensible to adopt a method whereby the state turns into distributor. There were times when people stood in line and begged. Now they no longer beg—they demand, they threaten, they blackmail, they attack. Obviously social justice does not mean that the state should share things out but that it should, from the very beginning, allocate the maximum possible share to workers, plants, the countryside, the cities, and the republics. Let them decide what to do with it afterward. In this way people's minds will be not on claims from the state, but on their own labor.

I meet economists and talk to them about inflation and excessive wages payments, G.Kh. Popov told the audience, and all I get in reply is this: The wages of party officials were increased this year, and you are talking about 10-percent raises in working people's wages. I personally agree that it was high time to increase party officials' wages. But at the same time I do feel that things like these ought to be explained to people.

The misfortune is not that the exchequer has no money but that we are unable to attract the population's money, was the opinion expressed by Professor R.A. Belousov, head of department at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences. When the New Economic Policy [NEP] was proclaimed, over 90 percent of budget revenues came from the population. This produced nothing. Prices shot up a thousandfold in just 1 year. Then they started thinking about increasing budget revenues and reducing expenditures. What do you think was the source of the supplementary budget funds? Transportation! Transportation provided almost 40 percent of total revenues in 1924. At that time the agriculture tax did not yield even 20 percent. Then came the thirties and collectivization. More money was printed. So they started looking for a different source of revenue. They came up with a turnover tax. Just six commodities—flour, leather, textiles, sugar, vodka, and tobacco—produced 80-90 percent of budget revenues. This is what rescued the country at the time. Now we cannot rely on such sources. It is necessary to seek ways to attract the money. The population is prepared to part with it—in exchange for good housing, furniture, and high-quality consumer durables. It is necessary to show more enterprise to ensure that the population's money starts flowing into the exchequer.

Evidence of such enterprise was seen in the speech by M.L. Aleksandrov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and general director of the "Nauchnyye Pribory" Intersector Scientific and Technical Complex. He suggested using the scientific base and technology to rapidly boost output of high-technology consumer goods within 1-2 years. This would require mixed enterprises on a joint stock basis. Shares would provide a basis not only for attracting additional funds but also for utilizing mixed forms of ownership and management. In this process, foreign firms in competition with one another would be investing capital in enterprises of ours which are in their line of business. Consequently, we would participate in the competition between our Western investors. In addition to this, they would be backing us on preferential terms in our "chokepoint" areas—technical progress and material and technical supplies.

The result of the involvement of Western capital potential in our enterprises, M.L. Aleksandrov firmly believes, would be that foreign investors, relying on their own potential and experience and responding to the demands of our commodity-starved market, would be able to rapidly organize and boost these enterprises' output of high-technology products for the population.

The mechanism for creating such joint stock corporations has already been worked out. We are talking about computers, videotape recorders, and microelectronic components which can be traded. It has been estimated that the manufacture of consumer goods can be increased approximately fiftyfold in 1 year using only the base of the USSR Academy of Sciences, taking it up to R100 million by the following year.

Another way to boost consumer goods was suggested by USSR People's Deputy Yu.V. Skokov, general director and chairman of the "Kvantemp" Intersector State Association. It boils down to having all deliveries of raw materials used in the manufacture of consumer goods being themselves treated as consumer goods by the suppliers. This sum should be deducted from the end producer. This would make it possible to take into account the material interests of all participants in the production of commodities so badly needed by the market—from the production of raw materials to the assembly of finished products. Moreover, only physical indicators should play a part in planning and incentives.

This is a production worker's view of how it might be possible to fill the empty store shelves. But how is this perceived by ordinary housewives? Let's make no secret of it, they still resent the economic reform. Their opinion should not be discounted, because it ultimately determines the social climate throughout the country.

Let us not forget, A.N. Komin, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Prices, noted, that we are dealing with a society which for years was treated almost in the way people treat children. We were told: We'll feed you, we'll give you clothing and footwear, we'll raise your wages—and our people got accustomed to waiting for boons "from on high." Now that they have been told that we are not living well, that we are lagging behind the world, that they deserve a better life, the reply we get is: Let's have this better life. Perestroyka itself has unintentionally ended up on a consumerist track. As one of the participants in the debate put it, people have now come out into the streets who are burdened by past difficulties but have still not taken new ideas on board. This is the most dangerous situation which democracy can encounter.

Let us give this some thought.

Steps Toward a Market

The administrative edict system arrogantly rejected the law of value as an economic regulator. Is this not why our planned economy missed the scientific and technical revolution and ended up on the rocks? "Noncommercial" socialism meant the waste of the selfless labor of generations and the devastation of natural resources. The physical bartering of products—this cruel utopia—is no longer mentioned. But as the difficulties of economic reform mount up, we hear increasingly loud complaints by some scientists calling themselves "anticommercial" economists. They are against giving free rein to the law of value and releasing it from the constraints of a "normative" economy. They are trying to invent more and more new "indicators" which would supposedly help the armada of functionaries in the capitals to refloat the economy. This would be vividly reminiscent of the [I.Ye. Repin] painting "Volga Bargemen." With the only difference that those heaving on the towrope will the producers themselves, while the anticommercial pilots will be lounging on the top deck. They assure us that the "noncommercial" method will assure us plain sailing. They hold out inflation and consumer market shortages as indications that they are right. Meanwhile, their "tested" prescriptions offer as many advantages as walking on stilts offers over normal walking.

This style of thinking is still with us, many speakers said, even though life disproved it a long time ago. Dogmatic sentiments are as difficult to overcome as the bureaucratic thinking of the departmental apparatus, Academician A.M. Yemelyanov of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, USSR people's deputy and head of a department at Moscow State University, said in this context. The Law on Ownership, which assumes a multiplicity of ownership forms, is now being examined. Yet, there are some in our academic fraternity who, instead of offering constructive and businesslike advice to legislators, are expressing the opinion that the intention is almost to dismantle the economic foundations of socialism. They are almost at the point of writing a petition to the Central Committee. Meanwhile, when the Supreme Soviet session raised the question of limiting brokerage activity by cooperatives, which is the source of much speculation, the following week, while a decision was still pending, pressure started being exerted from below. Local administrators immediately "shut off the oxygen" for production cooperatives. You'll be shut down one way or another, they said. Some people had the glimmer of a thought that perestroyka and democratization might have been taken a little too far. Some apparently thought it necessary to watch out in case the favorite procedures of the stagnation years were restored. Therefore, I think that it is necessary to be very cautious in tackling the pressing questions of the economy so as to avoid unintentionally helping the conservative forces to apply the brakes on our perestroyka.

We seem altogether unable to get rid of requisitioning, R.A. Belousov, head of department at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, said in his speech. Grain requisitioning was introduced way back by Kerenskiy. We returned to it in 1918. We abandoned it in 1921, but it was reintroduced via collective farms [kolkhoz] in 1929-1930. This system is in no way inherent in socialism. Lenin said: We must resort to requisitioning in order to save the starving workers. Now, once again, requisitioning is doing well and prospering in our country, supposedly for the sake of lofty goals. Let me cite two examples. A rule was introduced whereby an oblast, having met its plan targets, was entitled to dispose of its remaining produce at its own discretion. At the very same time Kaluga received from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers its third supplementary target for delivery of agricultural produce.

I recently met the director of a state farm [sovkhoz] in the Moscow region. Its losses run to R3 million, but the potato harvest was good. I said to him: "Now that potatoes are selling at 80 kopecks, why not channel some of the harvest into the market?" He replied: "And who will allow me to do this? The potato harvest was not successful all across the rayon, and the rayon will make me hand over everything I've got." This director has altogether lost any interest in seeking profits. Better to accept the subsidies and live a quiet life. Requisitioning is ruining our economy. It must be abandoned once and for all.

No matter how much production workers might hate the edict system, recent disruptions do seem to arouse some sort of nostalgia for it. For example, A.I. Tizyakov, general director of Sverdlovsk's "Mashzavod Imeni M.I. Kalinina" Science and Production Association, frankly voiced the following doubts:

We in the Urals have enterprises where finished products have been lying around for 2 months: We cannot ship them out. For their part, our partners are making a mess of deliveries. This causes social tension in the collectives. Are we not likely to reach the point where we'll have to take a step backwards for a while and reintroduce the edict system? Ministries have backed away from active work. They have already been restructured twice, preparations are under way for a third restructuring, and their apparatus no longer functions. We are tied to them—in terms of funds, materials, and components. If you need anything, you have to go out and hunt for it. This is how matters stand at present: You need bearings—give us a "Volga" in exchange, give us two railcars loaded with metal. There you have a trade system which, it goes without saying, unsettles everyone. Probably, no matter what anyone says, oblast party committees should evidently tackle this issue in earnest given the prevailing situation. In my view, the Law on the State Enterprise and other reform documents have not been worked out very precisely.

V.P. Moskalenko, deputy general director of Sumy's M.V. Frunze Science and Production Association, dwelt on certain lessons of the economic reform. Many enterprises, he said, used their autonomy not quite in the way they were meant to, and this resulted in the downward revision and nonfulfillment of plans. I would like to draw special attention to the practice of evaluating enterprises' work. Superior organs, primarily sector management organs, evaluate their work in terms of commodity output volume. Earlier on, starting in 1965, the main evaluation indicator was sold output. Commodity output means finished output, while sold output means output shipped to the client under a contract and paid for by him. Only sold output ensures revenue for the enterprise and the budget and helps to balance the economy. Output must be evaluated according to this indicator, coupled with the fulfillment of delivery targets.

Finally, state orders must be made to live up to their name. In other words, they must be given priority. It is time to put a stop to the names game. Superior organs should not interfere with already formed plans by coming along with new taxes and normatives. This should be done beforehand. For example, during the first quarter of this year the government decided on a 30-percent reduction in long-term loans. But contracts had already been concluded and plans shaped on the basis of loans agreed upon in advance. This decision, which had the effect of a cold shower, produced further imbalance in our economy. We are coming up against the problem of people being released as a result of the introduction of economic accountability and contract forms of labor organization. But we have no countrywide solution to the question of retraining or protecting the rights of those who are temporarily unemployed. These questions must also be immediately solved.

The difficulties which the economy is now experiencing have been described as signs of a crisis, Academician G.A. Arbatov, USSR people's deputy and director of the United States of America and Canada Institute, said. But a crisis does not mean a catastrophe. We have a real chance of recovering from the illness and emerging "healthier" and revived. But a diagnosis alone is not sufficient to achieve this. We need effective "medicines." We cannot nurture any illusions about a directive plan fitting in with the market. Yet we lack a clear plan for such an unprecedented transition. And another point. It is necessary to rapidly impose order. It is not mandatory to adopt the Law on Ownership in order to unload railcars. There can be no economic upsurge without order and organization. Our life must be governed not by confusion in the face of hardships, not by fear of innovation, but by activity targeted on large-scale and most responsible work.

But why has the economic reform produced such unexpected fruit? Many speakers pondered this question. A realistic analysis of the lessons of reform was provided by Academician S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

We have embarked on dismantling the edict system without backing up this work with the introduction of an appropriate new set of tools. This dismantling has basically affected the circulation and use of monetary resources. But the flow of material resources is still in the grip of rigid state regulation. This divergence is the cause of today's economic imbalance. Until this contradiction is resolved, all further reform steps, including the development of ownership forms, will yield no success. Another miscalculation lies in the fact that we have virtually lost control over the growth of wages and incomes. Until 1987 wages were planned, and after that we switched to their normative determination. There was just a single constraint—the correlation between productivity growth and wages growth. This constraint failed to work. When lifting controls on incomes we failed to foresee the potential threat and only thought about it when it started growing.

What path should be followed in the future? I think that the main strategic avenue involves movement in the direction of the market. There can be no argument about this today. The process of shaping the market must be controlled. We need tools which are yet to be discovered. Even if we actively develop leasing and shareholding forms, there can be no question of any real economic accountability unless we also have a producer goods market. The market will not emerge automatically without a flexible pricing system. These are virtually the two most important factors, and we will make no real progress unless we get them in place.

Regional Economic Accountability: Search for a Formula

How rational are specialization and cooperative ties in the form in which they currently exist, and what will they lead to? This was how V.E.G. Bresis, chairman of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers, started his speech. They will lead to huge and ruinous crosshauls. On the other hand, they may narrow the room for maneuver in cases when one enterprise supplies the entire country with some product. After all, this enterprise would only have to "slip up" for our entire economy to come a cropper. That is why we have to think about how to return to a sensible combination of sectorial and territorial principles of economic management. There is one path in this area: Via the Law on Ownership to a full-fledged national economic complex and full-fledged interest. Currently this interest does not exist. The results is a "no holds barred" struggle for ownership. Union concerns are being set up and it is even being suggested that republic enterprises join them—with the union concern having ownership rights of, of course. So as to subsequently run these concerns, of course.

I think that this approach is not the best way out of the situation; the economy will not benefit from it, it will suffer.

The speaker also dwelt in detail on the question of the status and function of current ministries, some of which—in his opinion—should be made more akin to union trading and purchasing firms operating on the principles of economic accountability.

The other problem he dealt with was the problem of leveling with regard to republics. In this area the principle of equivalence should come into play: A republic should remit to the union as much as it earns. The remaining product stays at the republic's disposal. A republic is entitled to use it on the domestic and foreign markets.

I think, G.Kh. Popov noted in this respect, that the time has come in our perestroyka when we should give everyone—enterprises, republics, and territories—the utmost opportunity to operate independently....

But is there any country in the world where everyone does what they want? M.S. Gorbachev asked.

[Popov] It's not a question of who wants what. The main thing is to put everything on the table. Nobody can take more off the table than we have put on it, even if they wanted to.

[Gorbachev] This means that, above all, we must produce, and there must be regulation. We must be realistic and utilize only those aspects of world experience that have proved their worth.

[Popov] In the West the market has been organized. But in this country we now want to have the organized structure of a market without the actual market itself.

[Gorbachev] For Selyunin everything is easier. He says that the market itself will sort everything out within a month.

Response from the auditorium: "A month won't be enough...."

I know one thing, M.S. Gorbachev noted, within a fortnight this kind of "market" would make the whole people take to the streets and topple any government—however much it pledged its loyalty to the people.

It has turned out that the Baltic republics and Belorussia have been the first areas in the country to switch to the system of economic independence, A.G. Granberg, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department's Economics and Organization of Industrial Production Institute, noted, reviewing the problems of regional policy. These republics are similar in the sense that they have a developed agricultural system and a predominant proportion of processing industry. However, I think that the experiment in 1990 will not be sufficiently correct or "pure" if other sorts of regions are not included in it. What kinds of regions? Regions specializing in the production of means of production, particularly for the development of raw material sectors. Such regions, with limited opportunities for changing their specialization, with a high cost of living, and with difficult ecological situations, cover four-fifths of the country. Above all, they need large amounts of capital investment in their production and social infrastructure. That is why it would be very important to try to switch the best-prepared of these regions—Tartaria and Kemerovo and Sverdlovsk Oblasts—to new economic conditions next year.

In recent years progressive decisions from the standpoint of regional development have been made to provide incentives for expanding consumer goods production. These decisions are aimed at ensuring that the goods obtained over and above the plan remain in the regions. However, regions specializing in the production of means of production have found themselves in a more difficult situation. The fragile balance of interests in these areas has broken down. That is why all oblasts in the East which are preparing to switch to the new conditions are including in their concepts the right to dispose freely of means of production, and to do so at contract prices.

In the academic's opinion, real opportunities are being created in the East for the consumer goods market and the producer goods market to move toward each other.

All republics and regions will be interested in the opportunities for expanding such an exchange, albeit at increased prices at times.

Unfortunately, it was noted during the discussion, the radical reform concepts that have been worked out and are beginning to be put into practice in many republics have not yet touched the RSFSR as a whole. We cannot consider the setting up of "our own" Ministry of Internal Affairs and a number of departments that have long existed in other republics to be a major success. The RSFSR, on whose territory more than 60 percent of all-union potential is concentrated, needs a radical concept for its sensible decentralization.

The question of socialist ownership and the forms of its development was probably no less acute than the problems of inflation and the choice of ways to move toward the market.

What Is the Best Soil for Raising Owners?

What is the basis of the developed countries' economies? They reside on four major foundations. These are ownership, the market, competition, and solid currencies, was how USSR People's Deputy K.P. Prunskene, first deputy chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers, entered the discussion. If any component of this foursome is lacking, the economic mechanism will not work. While "looking" for the lost elements of an effective economy, we must bear in mind that these elements may differ from one republic or region to another. Everywhere has its own features.

Take ownership. When we in Lithuania adopted the Law on Peasant Farms, for instance, masses of people came forward wanting to set up their own family farms. It is clear that this brings the question of ownership and land to the fore. However, it is simply impossible at the moment to directly raise the question of private ownership of land in Lithuania. People who owned the land which is currently worked by other peasants are still alive. This means that conflict could not be avoided. Of course, the approach could be quite different in other regions.

Or how should we set up joint-stock companies? Here, too, everything is probably ambiguous: People's mentalities are quite different. By turning state enterprises into joint-stock enterprises, it is hardly likely that we will automatically turn their workers into shareholders. The idea that workers should invest their own money in the development of production—when it has been ingrained in workers' mentality that it is owned in common (and therefore, to all intents and purposes, by nobody)—is by no means to everyone's liking. Some are prepared for it, others are not.

That is why I think we should not state things in absolute terms or produce a standard-issue reform for all republics. On the contrary, it strikes me that diversity in forms and methods is far better and more effective than unification. Here we need to heed the opinion of republics and regions and take account of the situation prevailing there.

Economic independence, for which my republic is striving, is an example of such a diversity of approaches toward economic development. Holding regions back or imposing standards is the wrong approach. We now need mutual understanding and we must take account of promising policies both for individual peoples and for all of us.

One last remark on ownership. I am in favor of the law guaranteeing land and natural resources to those people who live on the territories in question. The peoples have inherited this wealth from their forefathers—it was not the Soviet authorities that created the land and its resources.

But take the following situation, M.S. Gorbachev noted. Take, for instance, a thinly populated territory with immense underground resources. These have been exploited by many republics, including Lithuania. What are we to do in this situation...? After all, the level of the division of labor and production sharing in our country is higher than in the overall European market. In other words, we, too, have a kind of 'European' market of our own. As to how it functions, what its relationships are, and what the principles are on which it is based—all that is another matter. We should work thoroughly in this area. We must proceed on the basis of realities, irrespective of whether we like them or not, and analyze them in the spirit of the times and the tasks of perestroyka. This, I think, is the right approach.

So far, Academician O.T. Bogomolov said, we have mainly focused on which forms of ownership should be made legal. Yet we also need a mechanism for creating them. This difficulty is currently being encountered by the Hungarians and the Poles. Yes, nationwide ownership has been impersonal and faceless. We have to find owners for such property. But how? To share things out per person, as the Chinese did when they started leasing land? To share things out by enterprise? Then some will get more and others less. This, I think, is where we should take a look at the Hungarian experience of the development of joint-stock companies, whereby the lion's share of securities are held by the state. At the same time, some shares enter circulation. They are acquired by the enterprise's workers or workers at other enterprises. This approach makes it possible to attract foreign capital to the benefit of the country. We should think about this, because without such inherent mechanisms the Law on Ownership itself will remain unutilized and unsuitable for practical application.

Talking about the discussions centering on the legislation on forms of ownership, A.M. Yemelyanov noted:

"When you familiarize yourself with certain concepts, you get the impression that we're back in February 1917. For instance, the opinion is being expressed that peasant farms should be the basis of our renewed agrarian sector.

I am in no way opposed to peasant farms. I would be glad if, for instance, there were families in my ravaged Smolensk area who were ready to farm the land independently. I wouldn't even balk at building them a free homestead.

But if there are strong kolkhozes or sovkhozes in certain places, how can we decide for them on the quiet just how they are to develop in the future and what path they are to take? An acute question is: What are we to do with loss-making farms? It is proposed that they be disbanded by 1992. But how many such farms are there in the country? They are kept afloat by purchase price supplements. And what if the reform of wholesale prices reveals that half, if not more, of our farms are loss-makers? What will we do with them?

There is a shortage of realism to be found in the concepts advanced by certain academicians proposing a new division of the land. We need to be based more firmly on reality and to support the idea of a multiplicity of forms of economic management.

We should probably be stricter about the publication of various kinds of resolutions. If we cannot carry out certain resolutions they should not be adopted at all. A.M. Yemelyanov illustrated this idea with the following example. The appeal from agrarian deputies contains a call for reduced state orders. Yet under previously adopted decisions there should no longer be a single percent of mandatory state orders not only on kolkhozes and sovkhozes, but even in rayons. Orders should be purely voluntary—it is stated in black and white. So what are we asking for, in that case? Apart from monetary inflation, our country is clearly also suffering from "inflation" in the field of resolutions, which leads to disparities between words and actions. We should increase demandingness at all levels.

We have talked a very great deal about masters on the land, USSR People's Deputy A.A. Nikonov, president of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, noted. But masters will only be produced when they have the means of production and the right to deal with their own output. What are we to do with the land? We have repeatedly examined this question at the Supreme Soviet Agrarian Committee. This is our conclusion: The land should nonetheless remain the property of all the people. After all, it is not a commodity which can be resold or exchanged. We concluded that the land, as the property of all the people, is the property of the people in union and autonomous republics and in other union formations. It can be used in any form: The state, cooperative, or individual-labor form. For us this is a new, although not undisputed formula for the agricultural system. There is also another formula: Lifelong ownership in succession and use of the land. Which of these is better is a moot point on which thorough work will clearly still have to be done.

The diversity of forms of ownership affects the future prospects of kolkhozes and sovkhozes. It strikes me, the academic said, that it is farfetched to call their destiny into question. There can be no question of decollectivization. But we must really ensure legal guarantees for competition between different forms of economic management and ownership. We simply need competition. The objective conditions and traditions of the population in many parts of the country are favorable for the development of peasant farms. It is for the peasantry themselves to choose their form of economic management—nothing should be imposed.

It strikes me, G.Kh. Popov said, that being a Marxist also means taking a Marxist approach to private ownership. According to Marx, private ownership is a form of the development of productive forces. If the level of these forces' development is not advanced, then private ownership is absolutely necessary. It is not a sphere for any subjective manifestations on the principle of whether people do or don't like it. From this standpoint it is quite obvious to me that not only we but even countries that are more developed from the position of the socialization of production have not yet reached a level which will make it possible to develop without making use of the form of private ownership. We should bring production relations and ownership relations into line with each other, not least by taking account of the real level of the development of productive forces. If we have jumped the gun in certain areas or made a wrong move, it in no way means that we have retreated from Marxism.

Our Course Is Perestroyka

I think that we have finally reached the most important basis of the radical economic reform, V.A. Medvedev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, noted. We are now well aware that without substantial changes to the forms of socialist ownership, a new economic mechanism cannot be created. This understanding is clearly becoming a predominant, if not universal, realization—that is why such a great deal of attention has been devoted to these issues at the Supreme Soviet session.

The efforts made by theorists and practitioners are aimed at overcoming people's alienation from the means of production. It is clear that this problem cannot be solved without fundamental changes to the forms of social ownership. The forms which social ownership assumed in previous stages have showed themselves to be inefficient. The natural question is: How should we proceed? Before answering it, we must know what has preceded us and what is already known of human economic history. I think that the current undervaluation of this experience can be explained to a considerable extent by the exaggerated interest in private ownership and the certain euphoria in that regard which can currently be discerned in our literature and public opinion.

It seems to me that we should not succumb to this euphoria. At any rate, it should not be the guiding principle behind our proposals and decisions. Practice shows that private ownership is historically limited and, even under capitalism, its profound transformation has been obvious. Joint-stock companies, as Marx noted, are part of the process of the withering of private ownership—although, of course, private ownership retains its importance in certain spheres and functions.

I agree that we should proceed on the basis of the dictates of the classic law of correspondence between production relations and forms of ownership on the one hand, and the level of the development of productive forces on the other hand, although we should perhaps not approach this law mechanically and crudely as we did in the past. We must take into account the conjunction of social factors and organizational relationships, and much else besides.

With this approach there is no need to return to the classic forms of private ownership, at least in the main spheres of the socialist national economy. We must not proceed purely on the basis of our dissatisfaction with what existed before, or on the basis of what private ownership has produced in our own time. We should proceed on the basis of the specific requirements and real conditions of our economic and social development under present-day conditions.

The main thing in solving this problem is to set up a system of flexible forms for involving and uniting people with the means of production while preserving the basic nature of socialist socialization. This, above all, means the lease system—but not along traditional lines, rather leases of a new socialist type. They could be the predominant form of the socialist assimilation of funds and the results of production and will make it possible to awaken both collective and personal interest.

In this regard I would like to recall yet another of Marx' ideas. Talking about the historic trend of capitalist accumulation, he drew attention to the dialectics of negating negation in economic development, the result of which is the restoration of individual ownership, but on a new basis. I admit that we used to be confused about why we needed individual ownership. But it seems to me that there is profound sense in this. The same sense that was developed by Lenin in his ideas on economic accountability, the cooperative system, and leases.

After all, our task is to restore individual and collective incentives for work—incentives that have been severely suppressed as a result of wholesale state control [ogosudarstvleniye]. That is why we need modern, efficient, and flexible forms of organizing social production, whereby socialist ownership provides scope for individual and collective interest and initiative which is at least not inferior to incentives based on private ownership. It is important not to dwell on the stereotypes of the recent past but to proceed purely on the basis of the interests of the job and the tasks of making our economy more dynamic and enhancing the role of people in it.

Now to ownership of the land. I recall the well-known thesis that the nationalization of land in Russia and in other countries was seen as the most radical purging of economic relations in preparation for the development of capitalism in agriculture. Hardly anyone can doubt the correctness of this thesis. This was a radical measure which cleared away the obstacles of feudalism for capitalism. But, under the new system, it provided something more—a way of ensuring the fairest and most rational use of the land. So why now call this measure into question?

I think that nationalization of the land and ownership of the land by all the people is in no way an obstacle to any promising forms of agriculture, including the right of permanent use and the right of inheritance. We hardly need to set up private-ownership barriers in land relations.

One other thing. We were right to criticize the overblown nature of state ownership. Indeed, it was a kind of fetish which blinded us to a certain extent.

We now see state ownership in a more specific and pragmatic way: As union ownership, republic ownership, municipal ownership, and so forth. This is probably the right attitude with regard to the land and natural resources. But this is where problems that are clearly not so much economic as political and questions of prestige crop up.

If we put political arguments aside, the economic issue of ownership of the land and other natural resources boils down to two practical matters. The first is the appropriation of rent, the second is the right to use certain natural resources and the land. The question today is: Can the union state and our union as a whole appropriate rent? I think it not only can but should. Just as the union should participate to some extent in regulating the use of natural resources. This is the path on which we should seek a legislative solution to the aforesaid problems, without giving any scope to the desire to bring political emotions into play on this issue.

Now I would like to make some maybe incomplete observations about ways of getting out of the current very difficult situation in the consumer market. We need a range of measures. That is beyond doubt. But it seems to me that no amount of goods and no increase in services can catch up with the current growth in monetary income. After all, a 10-percent growth in such income means a real increase in market demand of not 10 percent but 15 and even 20 percent.

This means that we need to regulate monetary income. In what way? We can hardly resolve this task purely by means of a progressive tax on wages funds. Moreover, such taxation gives rise to a desire to increase these funds. Taxes bring in large sums for the budget, from where they are spent once again on paying wages. That is how another channel of inflation can be formed. That is why I believe that the main way is to seek methods to make wage growth strictly dependent on increases in the volume and, particularly, the efficiency of production. In principle we need an entire arsenal of means to regulate incomes.

I would like to wholly support the ideas expressed by the comrades on the need for a systematic approach to the deepening of economic reform. We have whittled it away bit by bit. For good or ill, at the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum it constituted a comprehensive solution to the main problems of the economic mechanism, organizational management structure, and centralized leadership. Perhaps certain provisions already seem inadequate and even naive, but it was undoubtedly systematic. Then it was whittled away. Who is to blame? We are. As are the academics.

I have never agreed that we ever submitted to pressure or faintheartedly rejected the idea of implementing price reform. Needless to say, it is important that the reform should not simply be an act of raising retail and wholesale prices. It should involve the sensible improvement of all price formation without detriment to the population's real income. After all, we all clearly realize that without economically justified prices there will be no radical reform as a whole.

Many comrades have done a veritable somersault in the space of a year. From propagandizing price reform they have switched to resolute denials of it. It seems to me that economists should take a more principled line and not give way to sentiment and emotion, but strive to channel public opinion in the direction dictated by urgent economic need. We should meet people halfway, explain to them any issues that may arise, and not give up our positions. Then we would not have the situation which has emerged now, when we are bound hand and foot. I think that there is no justification for delaying reform of wholesale prices. In short, I would like to call for a return to the systematic approach to economic reform.

At the end of the discussion M.S. Gorbachev spoke.

Key Ministries Assess Transportation Problems

904H0028C Moscow GUDOK in Russian
22 Oct 89 p 1

[Article by V. Sluzhakov: "Is Shouting Unavoidable?"]

[Text] There has not been a teleconference so representative at the MPS [Ministry of Railways] since this spring. One may interpret this fact as a recurrence of the old command-and-administrative system of management which the national economy is trying to abandon. If it is so, then only in part. After all, a full-fledged replacement of the arbitrary method by economic accountability has not come about yet.

Economic regulation turns out to be poorly conceived and spins its wheels in the most unexpected instances. The painful process of transition to a new path of economic management is under way. As was noted at the last meeting of the USSR Council of Ministers, the situation in the industrial complex is extraordinary. Such is the peculiarity of the time.

Unfortunately, against this background transportation gives too much cause for dissatisfaction. Only one-third of the railroads are fulfilling transportation plans. Industrial enterprises are stopped, and their operations are disrupted due to the shortage of raw and other materials. We do not ship even what we have purchased for hard currency, the stacks of merchandise at the ports and border crossings.

However, all of these rebukes in their entirety can hardly be addressed to railroad employees. In the words of Minister N.S. Konarev, at the meeting of the Council of Ministers he offered an unambiguous answer to the question concerning the operation of the industry in winter: "The kind of winter we are going to have will depend on how they are going to unload cars." Indeed, this is not new, but this is a truth which cannot be ignored. It is difficult to count on a favorable outcome if this truth is not understood in the field. The telegrams which now pile up high in the central government and party organs, "Give us cars," will not help either.

In this sense, the Kemerovo Railroad is doing the impossible. They are aware here that fuel problems will not be solved without the coal from the Kuzbass. At the same time, Chief of the Railroad A. Tuleyev once again mentioned that the headquarters of the industry does not provide empty cars for the miners. The minister did not deny the fault of the MPS drawing the attention of railroad regulators to improving the compliance with delivery schedules. The situation is such that enterprises of the iron and steel industry have slightly over one-half of the standard 2.2 million-ton stock of coking coal.

The attention of ministries, republic, kray, and oblast authorities was once again urgently invited to nighttime unloading operations with a view to extricating the missing cars. At the Kemerovo Railroad, nighttime unloading comes to 60 percent of daytime operations whereas nationwide it does not reach 30 percent, and in places declines to 14.

The USSR Minister of Metallurgy V.I. Pankrushin admitted that the enterprises of Yenakiyevo and Makeyevka have been preventing the conduct of a businesslike conversation with the MPS for a long time. Incidentally, GUDOK has written about these enterprises on many occasions. However, their managers make their relations with railroad employees worse year after year.

Unfortunately, sea ports and railroads of the Far East are unable to overcome the stage of confrontation. The USSR Minister of Maritime Fleet Yu. Volmer was forced to intercede in order to prevent the dialogue at the meeting from deteriorating into the settlement of accounts.

Indeed, the situation is such that at times the nerves can't take it. However, will rebukes, accusations, and finger-pointing help? It is, however, necessary to shed the light on the reasons for which this picture has become possible. Otherwise, we will not learn to prevent critical situations. After all, several dozen more vessels carrying imported goods are approaching the ports of our country. We will have to pay for their delays out of our thin foreign-currency wallet.

The ministers of railways and of the maritime fleet assured the chairman of the government that everything will be shipped out of the ports before the end of the month. Let us hope that they will keep their word and that the gaping void on store shelves will be filled.

Alas, the teleconference which lasted almost 3 hours and was attended by ranking functionaries of the ministries, departments, the Council of Ministers, the KNK [Committee of People's Control], the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions], and a number of other organizations has shown that for now we cannot do without this method of management. Managing in new ways remains but a beautiful slogan for many people.

Silayev Attends Quality Control Forum

PM0611150189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "How to Control Quality"]

[Text] Dozens of proposals for improving the practice of output quality control in industry and construction were voiced at an all-union conference in Moscow 3-4 November. Taking part were ministers of the USSR and deputy ministers, the leaders of enterprises, planning and design organizations, and state acceptance services, technical control department workers, and specialists. They discussed the report on the work of the national economy to improve the quality of output and ameliorate the role of the State Committee for Output Quality Control and Standards organs in quality control. V.V. Sychev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Output Quality Control and Standards, delivered the report.

The participants in the conference appealed to the workers of the national economy to activate work on improving the quality of the output produced.

I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, took part in the work of the conference.

Military

Yazov Comments on U.S.-USSR Military Contacts

AU0811162489 Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI in Polish 6 Nov 89 p 3

[NOVOSTI "special interview for ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI" with USSR Defense Minister Dimitriy Yazov, by an unidentified NOVOSTI correspondent: "Soviet and American Military Contacts"—date and place not given]

[Text] [Question] Dimitriy Ivanovich, what is the significance of your recent visit to the United States in the context of Soviet-American relations?

[Yazov] The visit of the Soviet delegation to the United States was a further step in strengthening trust and mutual understanding in Soviet-American relations. The importance of this step lies in the fact that it was done in the military sphere and strengthens the positive changes that have occurred in this sphere over the last few years. These changes are seen to be directly linked to the general improvement of the political climate.

It has to be said that while in the United States, meeting and speaking with the leaders of the U.S. Administration and the secretary of defense, we constantly felt the influence of two factors. The first of these was the effect of the talks that Eduard Sheverdnadze had with James Baker in Wyoming shortly before our arrival. The second was the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush which is due to take place some time in the first half of next year. Seen from this angle, the Soviet visit had the effect of yet another force for increasing the dynamism and stability of Soviet-American relations.

[Question] What impression did Richard Cheney, U.S. secretary of defense, make on you?

[Yazov] During my 5-day stay in the United States, I met the secretary of defense several times and on different occasions. Of course, our direct contacts were not very long, but the subject and intensity of our talks, as well as the joint desire to understand one another, made up for this. That is why I came away with the impression that Richard Cheney is very competent, means what he says, is a decisive and tough person who, at the same time, is willing to hear the opinions of his interlocutor. In a nutshell, he has all the attributes that a national and political leader of such high rank requires.

[Question] Can you tell us what it is that you found most interesting during your visits to U.S. military installations?

[Yazov] We visited several such military installations—namely, the North Island Air Base of the U.S. airborne and naval forces in San Diego on the Pacific coast of California, and two other U.S. military bases, one in Arizona and one in North Carolina. There were many interesting things to see, but perhaps the most interesting were the amphibious landings during U.S. Marine exercises at Camp Pandelton in San Diego. The Soviet delegation flew by helicopter to the general purpose assault ship "Belleau Wood." After an inspection of the ship, the Soviet generals and other officers went on board an amphibious hovercraft which was on the ship. This craft took us to the exercise beaches and there we were met by the commander of the division, General L. Monachan, who was directing the exercise. Greeting him, I said: "General, the first wave of the Soviet military delegation has arrived."

General Monachan and his staff appreciated the joke, just as they fully appreciated the significance of the fact that representatives of the Soviet military were present at one of the stages of these seaborne landing exercises of the U.S. air and naval forces. This fact reflects the times that we live in. Not controversy but cooperation—not confrontation, but confidence—not enmity, but mutual understanding. This is what the Soviet and American people, indeed, all the peoples of the world, want.

[Question] What are the development prospects for Soviet-U.S. military contacts in the 1990's?

[Yazov] We already have a certain amount of experience gained during the contacts so far. We met with F. Carlucci, former U.S. defense secretary, in Berlin for the first time. Later I met both him and Admiral I. Crowe, former chairman of the Joint of the Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces, in Moscow. There are also regular meetings between the chiefs of the general staffs of the armed forces of both countries and between military experts, doctors, and historians; visits by warships; and other contacts. Generally speaking, the 1988-89 plan of military contacts of this nature is being successfully implemented.

Of fundamental significance was the conclusion in September this year of a bilateral agreement to prevent dangerous military activity, and an agreement to inform each other of major maneuvers by strategic forces.

It is no exaggeration to say that military contacts between the USSR and United States possess an excellent basis. They only have to be consolidated and expanded. This will be encouraged by the agreement on jointly preparing the draft of a new plan of military contacts in the coming years which was concluded during the Soviet military delegation's visit to the United States. It is envisaged that this agreement will be ratified during the U.S. defense secretary's official visit to the USSR in 1990. I personally conveyed this invitation to the defense secretary during my recent visit.

Military contacts are an important component of Soviet-U.S. relations. The comprehensive consolidation and expansion thereof suits the fundamental interests of both peoples, and encourages the building of a new world free of nuclear weapons.